THE

Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. 6.] SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1809. [No. 5.

BIOGRAPHY.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE REV. GEORGE HERBERT.

THE Rev. GEORGE HERBERT was born in 1593, in the Castle of *Montgomery*, which had been long in the possession of the family of the *Herberts*. His father was *Richard Herbert*, great-grand-son of the famous Sir *Richard Herbert*, of *Colebrook*, in the county of *Monmouth*, Knight Banneret, who was the youngest brother of the memorable *William Herbert*, Earl of *Pembroke*, who lived in the reign of Edward the Fourth. His mother was *Magdalen*, the youngest daughter of Sir *Richard Newport*, of the county of *Salop*, Knight; a woman of personal excellence, mental accomplishments, and genuine piety. She was the mother of seven sons and three daughters; the eldest was *Edward*, who was made Knight of the Bath by James the First, and was afterwards sent by him as Ambassador to the Court of Lewis XIII. He was by Charles I. created Baron of *Castle-Island*, and soon after of *Cherbery*, in the county of *Salop*. He is well known as an author, and his book *de Veritate*, and his History of the Reign of Henry VIII. and several other Tracts, show him to have been a man of learning.

GEORGE was the fifth son. The early part of his education, and that of two of his brothers, was directed by a private tutor, under the eye of his mother, who had become a widow when he was four years old. When he was about the age of twelve years, he was commended, through Dr. Neale, then Dean of Westminster, to the care of Mr. Ireland, Chief Master of that School, where his behaviour, good parts, and early piety, were equally conspicuous. In this school he obtained a perfect

knowledge of the learned languages, especially the Greek, in which he after proved an excellent critic.

About the age of fifteen, being a King's Scholar, he was elected for Trinity College, Cambridge, to which place he was transplanted about the year 1608. His prudent mother well knowing that he might easily lose, or lessen that virtue and innocence which her advice and example had planted in his mind, procured the generous and liberal Dr. Nevil, who was then Dean of Canterbury, and Master of that College, to take him into his particular care, and provide him a tutor; which he gladly undertook, for he knew the excellencies of his mother, and how to value such a friendship.

Soon after this she was married to an amiable gentleman, the brother and heir of the Earl of Danby, who highly valued both her person, and the excellent endowments of her mind. During her widowhood these accomplishments were the subject of panegyric. The muse of Dr. Donne decked them with a poetic wreath.

> No *spring* nor *summer beauty* has such grace
> As I have seen in an *autumnal* face.

Of the latter he says,

> In all her words to every hearer fit,
> You may at *revels*, or at *councils* sit.

Her character, indeed, he has fully delineated in "The Autumnal Beauty," an elegy in his printed works. Her acquaintance was solicited by most men of worth and learning while she resided at Oxford, which she did a considerable time on purpose to be near her sons at College. Sensible of the advantages derived from the affable attentions of a mother, attentions equally distant from acerbity and the weakness of maternal indulgence, she endeared her children to her own company, which they justly estimated. For it was a maxim of her's, that as the body takes nourishment suitable to the meat on which it feeds, so the soul does insensibly take in vice by the example and conversation of wicked company. And that ignorance of vice was the best preservation of virtue, the mere

knowledge of wickedness being as tinder to inflame and kindle sin, and to keep it burning.

She died 1627, and Dr. Donne preached her funeral sermon in Chelsea Church, where she was buried.

Our author early devoted his poetical talents to divine subjects, as appears by the following letter and ode sent by him to his mother, the first year he was at Cambridge.

—" But I fear the heat of my late *ague* hath dried up these springs, by which scholars say, the muses use to take up their habitations. However, I need not their help, to reprove those many love-poems that are daily writ and consecrated to *Venus;* nor to bewail that so few are writ that look towards God and heaven. For my own part, my meaning *(dear mother,)* is in these sonnets, to declare my resolution to be, that my poor abilities in *poetry* shall be all, and ever consecrated to God's glory, and"—

My God, where is that ancient heat tow'rds thee,
Wherewith whole shoals of martyrs once did burn,
Besides their other flames? Doth poetry
Wear *Venus* livery? only serve her turn?
Why are not *sonnets* made of thee? and lays
Upon thine altar burnt? Cannot thy love
Height a spirit to sound out thy praise
As well as any she? Cannot thy *Dove*
Outstrip their *Cupid* easily in flight?
Or, since thy ways are deep, and still the same,
Will not a verse run smooth that bears thy name?
Why doth that fire, which by thy power and might
Each breath does feel, no braver fuel choose
Than that which one day, *worms* may chance refuse?
Sure, Lord, there is enough in thee to dry
Oceans of *ink;* for, as the deluge did
Cover the earth, so does thy Majesty:
Each cloud distils thy praise, and doth forbid
Poets to turn it to another use.
Roses and *lilies* speak thee; and to make
A pair of cheeks of them, is thy abuse.
Why should I *women's eyes* for crystal take?
Such poor invention burns in their low mind

Whose fire is wild, and doth not upward go
To praise, and on thee, Lord, some *ink* bestow.
Open the bones, and you shall nothing find
In the best *face* but *filth*; when, Lord, in thee
The *beauty* lies in the *discovery*. G. H.

He was an indefatigable student; but his assiduity was not more ardently and strenuously directed towards the acquisition of learning, than of the more important attainments of piety and virtue. And having a taste for music, he occasionally relieved his studies by yielding himself to the fascinating powers of harmony, by which, to use his own words, "his spirits, fatigued by application to study, were relieved, his distracted thoughts composed, and his soul raised so far above the earth, as apparently to relish the pleasures of heaven."

From his first entrance into the College, so intense was his application to learning, so becoming his behaviour, and so excellent his mental endowments, that Dr. *Nevil* was altogether charmed by him, and in the Doctor he found a discerning friend, who kindly excited his excellencies to still greater perfection, and ingenuously cautioned him against every impropriety into which he might be in danger of running, either by attaching too much self approbation to his person and parts, or indulging in the insignificant superciliousness so often observed in young men of high patronage.

Possibly the acute Doctor had seen in young *Herbert* an indication of these errors; indeed Mr. *Walton* (from whom these memoirs are taken) allows the excrescency to have existed, but discriminating *Nevil* detected it, and, it should seem, effectually removed it. He was made *Minor Fellow* 1609, Bachelor of Arts 1611, *Major Fellow of the College* 1615, and in that year was also made *Master of Arts*, being then in the 22d year of his age.

Mr. *Herbert* was now well known, and a vacancy happening in the Oratorship, he was, 1619, chosen Orator for the University, in which place he continued eight years, discharging it with ability unsurpassed by any of his predecessors or successors; for, in addition to the sweetest urbanity of temper, and elegance of manners, he was blest by nature with a fine fancy, and a piercing, though civil wit, which were all orna-

mented by his acquired learning, and set forth to the greatest advantage by the winning graces of eloquence.

The writer of the life of Mr. Herbert speaks highly of his fitness for the employment of Orator, by the notable occasion offered him through King James's sending to the University of Cambridge his book called Basilicon Doran; and their orator was to acknowledge this great honour, and return their gratitude to his Majesty for such a condescension; at the close of which letter he writ,

Quid Vaticanum Bodleianumq; objiciis, hospes?
Unicus est nobis Bibliotheca Liber.

This letter was written in such excellent Latin, was so full of conceits, and all the expressions were so suited to the genius of the King, that he inquired the Orator's name, and then asked *William*, Earl of *Pembroke*, if he knew him; whose answer was, "That he knew him very well; and that he was his kinsman, but he loved him more for his learning and virtue, than for that he was of his name and family." At which answer the King smiled, and asked the Earl leave, "that he might love him too; for he took him to be the jewel of that University."

This quotation from our biographical predecessor we chose to give as a sample of the taste of that arch-pedant James, and of the false genius, which, under the pedantic regimen of that Solomon, had usurped the place of wit, sense, learning, and even religion itself, through all orders of the community. We make this observation out of respect to the memory of *Herbert*, requesting equally the admirers of taste to recollect the school in which *Herbert* was formed, and the lovers of sound divinity not to forget that as the Presbyterian Monarch had the strongest *penchant* for the Papal Hierarchy, so the religion of the times was absurdly mixed with parade and nonsense.

Soon after Mr. *Herbert's* letter, "full of conceits," had "the great honour" of James's approbation, a countryman of the Monarch's, Mr. *Andrew Melvin*, having returned red-hot from Geneva, gave our author many opportunities to attempt to ward off the shafts with which Melvin's wit attacked the ceremonies, &c. of the Church of England, of which James, a true apostate, was outrageously enamoured, as were likewise all the

clergy. "This Mr. *Melvin* was a man of learning, and was the master of a great wit; a wit full of knots and clenches; a wit sharp and satirical; exceeded, I think, by none of their nation, but their Buchanan. At Mr. *Melvin's* return hither he writ and scattered in Latin many pieces of his wit against our altars, our prayers, and our public worship of God; in which Mr. *Herbert* took himself to be so much concerned, that as fast as *Melvin* writ and scattered them, Mr. *Herbert* writ and scattered answers and reflections of the same sharpness upon him and them; I think, to the satisfaction of all unengaged persons." *Melvin* was after this thrown into the tower, but the verses of his antagonist were judged by Dr. *Dupont*, Dean of *Peterborough*, not undeserving a more than ephemeral existence; he collected and printed them as an honourable memorial to his friend Mr. *Herbert*, and the cause he undertook.

James was fond of hunting, and frequently came into the neighbourhood of Cambridge to pursue his favourite sport. This produced several royal visits to the University, at each of which Mr. *Herbert*, in his capacity of Orator, offered him the applauses and gratulations of the body he represented. This introduced him not only to the notice, but likewise the favour of the King, and he had soon an order to attend the court at Royston, where, after a discourse with him, his Majesty declared to his kinsman, the Earl of Pembroke, "That he found the Orator's learning and wisdom were much above his age or wit." The year after the King was attended to Cambridge by the great *Bacon*, Lord *Verulam*, and the learned Bishop *Andrews*, both of whom commenced an intimate friendship with the Orator; and such was the opinion Lord Bacon had of his judgment, that he usually desired his approbation before he would send any of his works to the press, and paid him the compliment of dedicating to him, as the best judge of divine poetry, his English Version of some of the Psalms.

And the Bishop had soon an opportunity of expressing the high opinion he entertained of his friend, for a good natured debate having taken place between Mr. *Herbert* and himself on some theological doctrines, the former soon after sent him some excellent aphorisms in a letter written in Greek, which was so remarkable for the language and matter, that the Bishop

ever after carried it in his bosom, and took no small pleasure in exhibiting it among the circle of his learned friends.

Mr. *Herbert* knew what value to put upon a free intercourse with the wise and learned. Among his friends ranked Dr. *Donne*, and Sir *Henry Wotton*. The former a little time before his death, presented to each of his intimate friends a seal, with the figure engraved on it of Christ crucified, on an anchor, allusive to an expression he often used, *Crux mihi anchora.*

At Mr. *Herbert's* death these verses were found wrapt up with that seal given him by the Doctor:

When my dear friend could write no more,
He gave this seal, and so gave o'er.
When winds and waves rise highest, I am sure,
This Anchor keeps my Faith, that me secure.

But about this time he would probably have made shipwreck of his faith, notwithstanding the confidence expressed, had not divine providence kept him in port, for he made frequent essays to launch into the world, in the most treacherous bottom. His two preceding Orators were Sir *Robert Nanton* and Sir *Francis Nethersel.* The former had been made Secretary of State, and the latter Secretary to the Queen of Bohemia. Mr. *Herbert*, therefore, made himself master of the *Italian*, *Spanish*, and *French* tongues, and trudged after the court, seldom looking towards Cambridge, unless the King was there, and then he never failed. Though he sought the Secretaryship, all he could, however, obtain from James was a sinecure of 120l. per annum.—Perhaps to a person of Mr. *Herbert's* literary and polished mind, this gift was ideally enhanced by having been once held by the great Sir Philip Sydney, a small token of regard from his Royal Mistress Elizabeth.

Mr. *Herbert* wished to quit the University altogether, for, added to a strong inclination to improve himself by travelling, he had a delicate habit, inclined to fever and consumption, which seemed to render it necessary for him to relax in his studies; but his mother, perhaps fearing the probable danger that might follow the indulging the bias of his natural disposition, interposed her authority, which to him was sacred, and would be

no means allow him to leave Cambridge. His pious reflections on this event give us a charming trait of his character. How he attributes with gratitude this circumstance to the providence of God, may be seen in the copy of verses, entitled *Affliction.*

Whereas my birth and spirit rather took
The way that takes the town;
Thou did'st betray me to a ling'ring book,
And wrapt me in a gown.
I was entangled in a world of strife,
Before I had the power to change my life.

Yet, for I threaten'd of the siege to raise,
Not simp'ring all mine age;
Thou often didst with *academic* praise
Melt and dissolve my rage;
I took the sweetened pill, till I came where
I could not go away, nor persevere.

Yet, lest perchance I should too happy be
In my unhappiness;
Turning my purge to food, thou throwest me
Into more sicknesses.
Thus doth thy power cross-bias me, not making
Thine own gifts good; yet me from my ways taking.

Now I am here, what thou wilt do with me
None of my books will show:
I read, and sigh, and wish I were a tree,
For then I should grow
To fruit or shade; at least some bird would trust
Her household with me, and I would be just.

Yet, though thou troublest me, I must be meek,
In weakness must be stout:
Well, I will change my service, and go seek
Some other master out:
Ah, my dear God! though I am clean forgot,
Let me not love thee, if I love thee not. G. H.

About this time of Mr. Herbert's attendance at Court, all his expectations of preferment were suddenly defeated by the death of his two most obliging and powerful friends, the *Duke of Richmond* and the *Marquis of Hamilton;* and not long after *James* himself died, and with him all the ambitious hopes of our author, who now betook himself to the study of divinity, preparatory to his taking holy orders, to which his mother persuaded him. Great was the conflict between *the pride of life*, and the sincere desire he had of devoting himself to the work of the ministry; but the latter at last prevailed.

Acquainting a Court friend of his resolution to enter into orders, he urged him to alter his intentions, alledging the employment was too mean for a person of his birth and abilities; to which he replied, "It hath been formerly judged, that the domestic servants of the King of Heaven should be of the noblest families on earth; and though the iniquity of the late times have made Clergymen meanly valued, and the sacred name of Priest contemptible; yet I will labour to make it honourable, by consecrating all my learning, and all my poor abilities, to advance the glory of that God that gave them; knowing, that I can never do too much for him, that hath done so much for me, as to make me a Christian. And I will labour to be like my Saviour, by making humility lovely in the eyes of all men, and by following the merciful and meek example of my dear *Jesus.*"

He maintained his resolution, and was accordingly made Deacon; soon after which the Bishop of *Lincoln* gave him the Prebend of *Layton Ecclesia* in that Diocese. But the parish church being in a ruinous state, he made such exertions by his own bounty, and by his application to his noble relations and other friends, that he soon raised it out of its ruins, and re-edified it in a handsome manner. "By his order (says Mr. Walton) the reading-pew and pulpit were (erected) a little distance from each other, and both of an equal height; for he *(Herbert)* would often say, 'They should neither have a precedency or priority of the other; but that prayer and preaching being equally useful, might agree like brethren, and have an equal honour and estimation."

Whether the refined and metaphysical divinity of those days justly exalted the pulpit above the reading-desk, or whether

Mr. *Herbert* was perfectly justifiable in reducing it to the standard of its neighbour, or whether it ought now to be brought lower than the desk, we shall not presume to determine, but give place to Mr. Walton while he relates a pleasing anecdote connected with this part of our author's history.

Before I proceed farther, I must look back to the time of Mr. *Herbert's* being made Prebend, and tell the reader, that not long after, his mother being informed of his intentions to rebuild that church, and apprehending the great trouble and charge that he was like to draw upon himself, his relations and friends, before it could be finished, sent for him from *London* to *Chelsea* (where she then dwelt), and, at his coming said, "*George*, I sent for you, to persuade you to commit simony, by giving your patron a good gift as he hath given to you; namely, that you give him back his Prebend; for, *George*, it is not for your weak body and empty purse to undertake to build churches." Of which he desired he might have a day's time to consider, and then make her an answer: and at his return to her at the next day, when he had first desired her blessing, and she given it to him, his next request was, "That she would, at the end of thirty-three years, allow him to become an *undutiful son;* for he had made a vow to God, that if he were able, he would rebuild that church:" and then showed her such reasons for his resolution, that she presently subscribed to be one of his benefactors; and undertook to solicit *William*, Earl of *Pembroke*, to become another, who subscribed for 50l. and not long after, by a witty and persuasive letter from Mr. *Herbert*, made it 50l. more.

Having in the former part of this sketch intimated his regard to his mother, the following letter sent her by him may not be unacceptable:

"MADAM,

"At my last parting from you I was the better content, because I was in hope I should myself carry all sickness out of your family; but since I know I did not, and that your share continues, or rather increaseth, I wish earnestly that I were again with you; and would quickly make good my wish, but that my employment does fix me here, being now but a month to our *commencement:* wherein my absence by how much it naturally augmenteth suspicion, by so much shall it make my

prayers the more constant and the more earnest for you to the God of all consolation—In the meantime I beseech you to be cheerful, and comfort yourself in the God of all comfort, who is not willing to behold any sorrow but for sin—What hath affliction grievous in it more than for a moment? or why should our afflictions here have so much power or boldness as to oppose the hope of our joys hereafter?—*Madam!* As the earth is but a point in respect of the heavens, so are earthly troubles compared to heavenly joys. Consider what advantage you have over *youth* and *health* who are now so near those true comforts. —Your last letter gave me an earthly preferment, and kept heavenly for yourself: but would you divide and choose too? Our College customs allow not that, and I should account myself most happy if I might change with you; for I have always observed the thread of life to be like other threads or skeins of silk, full of snarls and incumbrances: happy is he, whose bottom is wound up and laid ready for work in the *New Jerusalem*—For myself, *dear Mother*, I always feared sickness more than death, because sickness hath made me unable to perform those offices for which I came into the world, and must yet be kept in it; but you are freed from that fear, who have already abundantly discharged that part, having both ordered your family, and so brought up your children that they have attained the years of discretion and competent maintenance— So that now if they do not well, the fault cannot be charged on you; whose example and care of them will justify you both to the world and your own conscience; insomuch, that whether you turn your thoughts on the life past, or on the joys that are to come, you have strong preservatives against all disquiet— And for temporal afflictions! I beseech you consider all that can happen to you are either afflictions of estate, or body, or mind—For those of estate, of what poor regard ought they to be, since if we had riches we are commanded to give them away? So that the best use of them is, having, not to have them—But perhaps being above the common people, our credit and estimation calls on us to live in a more splendid fashion:—But, O God! how easily is that answered, when we consider, that the blessings in the Holy Scripture are never given to the rich, but to the poor. I never find blessed be the rich, or blessed be the noble; but *blessed be the meek*, and *bles-*

sed be the poor, and *blessed be the mourners, for they shall be comforted*—And yet, O God! most carry themselves so, as if they not only not desired, but even feared to be blessed—And for afflictions of the body, *dear Madam*, remember the holy martyrs of God, how they have been burnt by thousands, and have endured such other tortures, as the very mention of them might beget amazement; but their fiery trials have had an end: and yours (which, praised be God, are less) are not like to continue long—I beseech you, let such thoughts as these moderate your present fear and sorrow; and know, that if any of your's should prove a *Goliah-like* trouble, yet you may say with *David, That God who hath delivered me out of the paw of the lion and bear, will also deliver me out of the hands of this uncircumcised* Philistine.—Lastly, for those afflictions of the soul, consider that God intends that to be as a *sacred Temple* for himself to dwell in, and will not allow any room there for such an inmate as grief; or allow that any sadness shall be his competitor. And, above all, if any care of future things molest you, remember those admirable words of the Psalmist, Psa. lv. *Cast thy care on the Lord, and he shall nourish thee.* To which join that of St. *Peter*, 1 Pet. v. 7. *Casting all your care on the Lord, for he careth for you.*—What an admirable thing is this, that God puts his shoulder to our burthen, and entertains our care for us, that we may the more quietly intend his service.—To conclude, let me commend only one place more to you, (Phil. iv. 4.) St. *Paul* saith there, *Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice.* He doubles it, to take away the scruple of those that might say, What, shall we rejoice in afflictions? Yes, I say again rejoice; so then it is not left to us to rejoice or not rejoice; but whatsoever befals us, we must always, at all times rejoice in the Lord, who taketh care of us: and it follows in the next verse; *Let your moderation appear to all men, the Lord is at hand; be careful for nothing.* What can be said more comfortably? Trouble not yourselves, God is at hand to deliver us from all, or in all.——*Dear Madam*, pardon my boldness, and accept the good meaning of

Your most obedient Son,

GEORGE HERBERT."

Trin. Col. May 29, 1622.

A few years after this, he was exercised with affliction, for putting himself under a particular regimen to remove a Quotidian ague, he fell into a supposed consumption, which was attended with great pains; but he bore with Christian patience the yoke of discipline, and under his acutest sufferings would often say, "Lord, abate my great affliction, or increase my patience; but I repine not; I am dumb, Lord, before thee, because thou dost it."

But removing to Damsey, in Wiltshire, then inhabited by his friend, the Earl of *Danby*, and declining all perplexing studies, the salubrity of the air, strict attention to diet, moderate exercise, and a cheerful conversation, soon restored him to his usual health; upon which he resolved to marry, and also to enter into Priest's Orders; for he had given up his Fellowship and his Orator's place at Cambridge, which he had held only at his mother's request, declining them at her decease.

The way to wedlock was soon opened, but not sooner than the object was both pursued and obtained by Mr. *Herbert;* and as the detail is given with no small apparent satisfaction by his biographer, we recite it in his words.

"I shall now proceed to his marriage; in order to which it will be convenient, that I first give the reader a short view of his person, and then an account of his wife, and of some circumstances concerning both—*He was for his person of a stature rather inclining to tallness; his body was very straight, and so far from being cumbered with too much flesh that he was lean to an extremity. His aspect was cheerful, and his speech and motion did both declare him to be a gentleman, for they were all so meek and obliging, that they purchased love and respect from all that knew him.*"

These, and his other visible virtues, begot him so much love from a gentleman of a noble fortune, and a near kinsman to his friend the earl of *Danby;* namely, from *Charles Danvers*, of *Bainton*, in the county of *Wilts*, Es . that Mr. *Danvers*, having known him long and familiarly, did so much affect him, that he often and publicly declared a desire that Mr. *Herbert* would marry any of his nine daughters, (for he had so many) but rather his daughter *Jane* than any other, because *Jane was his beloved daughter:* and he had often said the same to Mr. *Herbert* himself; and that if he could like her for a wife, and she

him for a husband, *Jane* should have a double blessing: and Mr. *Danvers* had so often said the like to *Jane*, and so much commended Mr. *Herbert* to her, that *Jane* became so much a Platonic, as to fall in love with Mr. *Herbert* unseen.

This was a fair preparation for a marriage; but alas! her father died before Mr. *Herbert's* retirement to *Dantsel;* yet some friends to both parties procured their meeting; at which time a mutual affection entered into both their hearts, as a conqueror enters into a surprized city; and love having got such possession, governed and made there such laws and resolutions, as neither party was able to resist; insomuch that she changed her name into *Herbert* the third day after this first interview.

This haste might in others be thought a *love-frenzy*, or worse: but it was not; for they had wooed so like princes as to have select proxies; such as were true friends to both parties; such as well understood Mr. *Herbert's* and her temper of mind; and also their estates so well before this interview, that the suddenness was justifiable by the strictest rules of prudence: and the more, because it proved so happy to both parties; for the eternal lover of mankind made them happy in each other's mutual and equal affections and compliance; indeed, so happy, that there was never any opposition betwixt them, unless it were a contest which should most incline to a compliance with the other's desires. And though this begot and continued in them a mutual *love*, and *joy*, and *content*, as was no way defective; yet this mutual *content*, and *love*, and *joy* did receive a daily augmentation, by such daily obligingness to each other, as still added to such new affluences to the former fulness of these divine souls, as was only improveable in heaven, where they now enjoy it.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

(From a Correspondent.)

A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

[Continued from page 274, and concluded.]

Conclusion.

THERE has often occurred to the author of this work, during the progress of it, the danger of a reader's suspecting him of an insidious design—that of insinuating concerning certain important subjects of religion, their being foreign to the sense of scripture; under the cover of merely proving, that there is nothing said of them in a particular book of it. At any rate, the inquiry occurs,—for what purpose was the investigation gone into?

To lay the foundation for a satisfactory answer to the inquiry and to remove the preceding apprehension; let there be noticed certain points, on which the Calvinists and the Arminians are agreed; and to which, of course, nothing in the preceding disquisition ought to be construed to apply.

They are agreed, in there being a departure in human nature, from its original righteousness; and this to such an extent, that no man can, of his own strength, raise himself above the condition in which the fall has placed him; or even make the least advance to that effect. It is alike agreed, concerning every step to restoration and every motion of the mind prompting to it, that they are induced by the agency of the divine spirit; the necessity of which is supposed, under all the distinctions and all the disputations, as to the manner of his operation. And farther, it is agreed, that the true and the only ground of acceptance with God, is in the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, through the sacrifice of the cross; all merit on the part of man being utterly excluded and denied.

As these matters are common to the litigants, so, let it be here understood, that they are believed in and now acknowledged,

by the writer of these remarks. If, in any thing which he has written, there should be thought a discovery of the contrary; he trusts, that it is through mistaken inference; and at any rate, he disowns all such supposed error.

But at the same time he believes, that, from the aforesaid truths of scripture, speculations have been educed; concerning which, no data towards reasoning are given to us in the scriptures. And although this has been affirmed and endeavoured to be proved of one book only; yet it is under the persuasion, that the same principles may be applied to the same use, concerning the books of scripture generally: not indeed to prove, that they decide nothing in the controversy, for indeed it is here thought that they decide a great deal; but to show, that there are some metaphysical discussions improperly introduced into theology and not at all spoken to in the word of truth.

At present, however, the author has no right to affirm further than to the extent of what he supposes to be the result of the examination of the Epistle to the Romans: and his inference from this is, that, in the conducting of the controversy, that book should be considered as not making for one side or for the other; and therefore left entirely out of the account.

As it must have been perceived and will not be denied, that the author is more inclined to the system of the Arminians, than to that of the Calvinists; the inquiry may be made—Why he should endeavour to deprive the former of any aid which they might suppose derived from the Epistle to the Romans? His answer is, that, next to his opinion of the true sense of the composition; there is the consideration of the tendency of his argument to show the untenable ground, on which Calvinism stands. It is well known, that this system rests its peculiar doctrines, more on the Epistle to the Romans, than on any other part and perhaps, than on all the rest of scripture. Accordingly; what are here supposed to be its errors are less likely to be satisfactorily exposed, by there being proved, if that happened to be the case, that the Apostle spoke more conformably to the Arminian than to the Calvinian hypothesis; than by there being proved, as is conceived to be actually the case, that the Apostle had another subject in contemplation; that every part of his argument is strictly pertinent to it; and that

there is no evidence in the composition, of there having crossed his mind, during the writing of it, a single thought on either side of any one of the points comprehended in the controversy.

After all, however, the author is aware, that there are a considerable proportion of serious people, who will not be reconciled to any plan of interpretation of this epistle; which shall make the taking in of the whole design of it a circumstance essential to the right understanding of any considerable part. This brings to mind a passage in the paraphrase of Mr. Locke. "I have heard sober Christians (says he) very much admire, why ordinary illiterate people, who were professors, that showed a concern for religion, seemed much more conversant in St. Paul's Epistles, than in the plainer, and as it seemed to them (meaning the former) much more intelligible parts of the New Testament. They confessed that though they read St. Paul's Epistles with the best intention, yet they generally found them too hard to be mastered; and they laboured in vain, so far to reach the Apostle's meaning all along in the train of what he said, as to read them with that satisfaction, that arises from a feeling, that we understand and fully comprehend the force and reasoning of an author; and therefore, they could not imagine what those saw in them, whose eyes they thought not much better than their own. But the case was plain: These sober inquisitive readers, had a mind to see nothing in St. Paul's Epistles, but just what he meant; whereas those others of a quicker and gayer sight could see in them what they pleased." If any reader of the present work should be dissatisfied with it, from an habit of thinking like that complained of by Mr. Locke; an appeal is here entered, from the judgment of such a person. The present writer may be mistaken in his interpretation; but by such a reader there cannot be obtained the true one; which does not lie near enough for him to the surface. It may be proper, however, to give him from this very Epistle and from a part of it foreign to the controversy which has been considered, a proof, how far from being obvious in St. Paul's meaning in the composition. The part of it in view, is his admonition in respect to meats. If there were set aside all reference to peculiar difference of the time; and if instructions were supposed to be given on the subject simply; it would undeniably follow, that no Christian should indulge him-

self in the use of meat, so long as there were a wrong-headed fellow Christian, who might be offended by it. But when the true sense is obtained by the consideration of cotemporary circumstances; it appears to be no more, than that the Gentile Christians ought not so to use their exemption from the institutions of the Mosaic law, as to give offence to the Jewish Christians, who supposed themselves thereby bound. In regard to the concluding words of this part of the Epistle, "Whosoever is not of faith, is sin;" the writer of this has heard it seriously contended for, as the sense of the words; and it is indeed so, when they are taken independently on the connection; that there is no action of a man's life, indifferent in regard to moral-good and evil; but that all is sin, except when God's glory is especially contemplated in the act. Every one who attends to the series of the discourse must perceive the meaning to be, that in every important transaction of life, a man's belief of his being right is an essential circumstance of his being so, as to intention and motive.

There may further be noticed, in regard to the Epistle to the Romans, as especially applicable to it, a remark made by St. Peter concerning the writings of St. Paul generally, where he says of them (2 Pet. iii. 16) "in which are some things hard to be understood; which they who are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures; to their own destruction." Now although sincerity of intention will prevent us, under the influence of divine grace, from abusing any part of scripture to our destruction; yet, in regard to the Epistle to the Romans, we shall never, without the use of extraneous helps which divine providence has furnished, obtain a clear apprehension of what an Apostle found difficult to be understood: and this itself should induce modesty in our interpretation, be it what it may.

If these sheets should meet the eye of any reader, who, in addition to the love of truth, the most necessary requisite for the study of any book of Scripture, possesses the share of erudition and has bestowed the strict attention to the chain of argument, which are exacted in an eminent degree by the book in question; in regard to such a reader, the author is aware, that, by writing on it, he has committed himself to the rigor of criticism; although, as he hopes, not to the severity of censure.

At least, he has endeavoured to avoid whatever could justly expose him to this: For while he has exercised his own right of religious inquiry, he has respected the rights of any others whom he has had occasion to advert to, either by name or otherwise; not having criminated or thrown odium, to the best of his recollection or with design, either on the motives or on the tendency of their writings.

To some it may give offence, that so considerable a book of holy Scripture should be represented as being principally employed on a temporary subject of litigation; not exciting any uneasiness in the Christian world, any longer than during the age in which the book was indited. That this should be no objection to the argument of the present work, might be proved from many parts of Scripture; which have evident relation to early errors, of no longer continuance than that of the perpetual obligation of the Mosaic law. In the Epistle which has been before us and extraneous to the portion of it taken into view, there is a whole chapter—the 14th—confessed by all to be intended of a difference of opinion, which soon expired; while yet the record of it remains.

As long as it shall remain, indeed, it will dictate a lesson of mutual forbearance, on points concerning which there may be a difference of opinion and of practice among Christians, without any injury to fundamental truths: a lesson, which, if it had been duly submitted to and acted on, would have prevented a great proportion of the breaches of the Church's peace. In like manner, in regard to the Apostle's argument in the first eleven chapters; there is not a single branch of it, however local and temporary as to its immediate objects, which may not be universal and perpetual, as to the benefit to be derived from it. By the Apostle's melancholy but true portraiture of heathen manners, we may be instructed, that if the lamp of revelation should be extinguished, the same would be again the result of the same depraved passions of human nature. The part of the argument which unveils the aggravation of the criminality of the Jews, in the contrariety of their practice to their law, will for ever admonish professing Christians, of the greater inconsistency of corrupt morals, in contrariety to the holy requisitions of the Gospel. If the Jews could not consider God as their debtor, in virtue of any obedience

which they could pay to the Mosaic law; with still less pretence can we arrogate the claim of merit to any obedience of ours, under a dispensation which takes us up as sinners; and proclaims, in terms not to be misunderstood, that all its benefits are of grace. When we read of collective bodies, not only in their civil existence, but in their visible profession of God's holy and eternal truth, that they are "as clay in the hands of the potter;" it not being, in respect to either, "of him that willeth or of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy;" there will always be presented a theme of gratitude for our being born under the light of Christianity; and for our being made, from infancy, members of Christ's kingdom, the Church. And when we learn the rejection of the Jews for their unbelief, accompanied by the solemn intimation to Christian Churches—"Take heed, lest, as he spared not the natural branches, he also spare not thee;" it will be, to the end of time, a lesson to every Christian Church, to "hold fast the form of sound words delivered to them;" lest there should happen that "moving of the candlestick out of its place;" which, in the Apostolic age, was threatened to some Christian Churches, then great and flourishing; and was at last awfully inflicted on them. But there is no part of the argument more instructive, than that which carries the expectation forward to a future display of the mighty power of God, in bringing back his people to the true flock and fold; when, as the Apostle quotes the Prophet Isaiah saying—"There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." There is in this a powerful incentive of faith and hope; especially when we observe, before our eyes, existing monuments of the accomplishment of the threatening; and when we perceive the train laid of events pointing to the better accomplishment of the promise; and destined to demonstrate, in regard to the ancient people, that "the calling of them is without repentance." And it is further obvious concerning the splendour of the prophet opened to us by this part of the Epistle, that it derives additional graces from the association of the event which has been referred to, with the "coming in of the fulness of the Gentiles;" in which, there will be fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi (chap. i. 11.) "From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in

every place, incense shall be offered to my name and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the Heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Besides that the branches of the Apostle's discourse may be made sources of information by easy and obvious accommodation; there shine forth, in this argumentative part of the Epistle divine truths alike applicable to all times and places. Such as the entailment of death, in consequence of Adam's sin; the danger of a second death, as the consequence of our own sins; the struggle between natural appetite and the better desire of the mind, which every man finds attested by evidence in himself; the danger of abusing divine grace to a continuance in sin; the duty of a death to sin, exacted by the Christian calling; the Christian sacrifice of an holy and virtuous state of mind, as a necessary accompanyment of a celebration of the sacrifice of the death of Christ; the consequences of being reconciled to God, in the confidence thus obtained of drawing nigh to him with the full assurance of faith; in the love—the peace—the joy which it inspires; in the patient endurance of injuries to which it disposes; and finally in the hopes beyond any the world can give, of which it is the ground. These and other like to these are salutary truths, lying conspicuous on the face of the discursive portions of the Epistle.

But even had there been nothing of the description stated, embodied with the argument; the composition would have been rendered invaluable, by the moral instructions contained in the concluding chapters. How cold are the morals of a Cicero, of a Seneca and of an Epictetus, compared with those of St. Paul, in respect to their being accommodated to the renovation of the heart; and their thus savouring of the unction, which the Holy Spirit only can pour out! God forbid, that under the show of zeal for moral rectitude, we should be indifferent to the duty of maintaining Gospel verity. But without endangering ourselves in this respect, we may affirm, that if professing Christians had always contended, under the influence of the morality of the concluding chapter of this Epistle, for the views of faith which they have respectively thought opened to them by the preceding chapters; they would not have been rendered by such contention, what we know to have happened often, the less "meet for the inheritance of the Saints

in light." And this is a lesson, which the author of the present work especially wishes to be impressed, by divine grace, on his own mind; lest the investigation in which he has been occupied should have the effect, of weakening in him the desire of the cultivation of that charity, which is better than the possession of all "mysteries and all knowledge."

For the Churchman's Magazine.

A Sermon, preached the 6th January, 1807, at the Consecration of St. John's Church, Hudson-Square, New-York: By the Rev. Isaac Wilkins, *Rector of St. Peter's Church, West-Chester, and St. Paul's Church, East-Chester.*

1 Cor. iii. 17.—*If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy.*

[Continued from page 219, and concluded.]

REMEMBER that to you of this truly primitive and Apostolic Church much has been given, and much will be required. To you have been committed the ten talents, and they must not be unproductive—they must be made to bring forth other ten talents, or you will have no claim to your reward. The charge of slothful and unprofitable servants will lie against you; and then even that which you have will be taken from you.

Reflect, I beseech you, upon the fatal downfall of those ancient churches, to whom the faith was at first delivered pure and undefiled; and which, founded and built up by the Apostles themselves, were once a bright and shining light to all around them; and the glory of their respective lands. What now are become of them? What are they at this day? *In those very places*, where the gospel spreads its rays—where the light of the sun of righteousness beamed forth in meridian splendour—*there* darkness now sits brooding—a darkness deep, dreadful, and deadly. Where pure religion, and undefiled before God, once shed its healing and immortal balm, superstition is now rending forth its blasting and contaminating poison—where the angel of Christ was showing forth the Redeemer's king-

dom, diffusing the knowledge of salvation, and bringing life and immortality to light through the gospel, an insidious impostor has barred up the way of life, a stupid Turk is preaching ignorance and Mahomet.

May the merciful interposition of our Almighty Redeemer save us from such deep degradation—from so deadly a downfall. May his Holy Spirit so animate our minds and hearts, that we may be made sensible of our danger; that we may repent, and do those works, and bring forth those fruits that are required of us.

Every tree, we are solemly assured, that bringeth not forth good fruit shall be hewn down and cast into the fire. So every church that doeth not the works for which Christ designed it, if repentance arrests not the hand of justice, is destined to destruction—its candlestick will be removed, and its light extinguished. It is then the barren and unfruitful tree, that incumbereth the ground, and must be cut down. It is then the salt that hath lost its savour; it is no longer of use, and fit only to be thrown out to the dunghill, and trampled under foot of men.

But while we ruminate upon the fall of those ancient churches, and lament the fatal change in those unhappy countries where they were, we must by no means forget to consider attentively the causes that led to those events, that we may, by avoiding the one, happily escape the other.

By presumptuously departing from the plain and unerring word of God, and being wise above what was written, they corrupted the faith. By a mixture of their own vain and profane imaginations with the sacred precepts and doctrines of the gospel, they introduced various and deadly heresies; schisms and dissentions multiplied among them, and confusion with every evil work ensued—the fervour of their zeal abating, they grew luke-warm; they forsook their first love; they profaned their worship and their temples by a temporizing, an unnatural, and impious mixture of Heathenism and Christianity; they became lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; and, impatient of *government*, they despised *authority*.

Having thus debased and degraded the gospel of their Redeemer—having dishonoured their Saviour and their God, and broken down the hedge of his vineyard, the wild boar was

suffered to root it up. Defiling themselves, their temples, and their religion, they were left to themselves—*and were destroyed.*

Their fate should be a warning to us. If we sin like them we may reasonably expect that our end will be like theirs. And is not the similitude of our crimes too obvious to be overlooked? Is not the description of those once flourishing, but now ruined and desolated churches of Asia, to which I have alluded, at the time of their downfal, a just and complete exhibition; a true and faithful representation of the present state of Christianity among ourselves?

If we take a general view of the state of the Gospel in this our land, and bringing together the great—I had almost said the infinite variety of opposite sects and parties into which its professors are unhappily divided—what do we behold? Do not the discordant parts exhibit a most deformed and alarming picture? Do we not perceive the foul and polluting figures of infidelity, idolatry, schism, and heresy prominent upon the face of it? Do we not in one part see the priesthood sacrilegiously invaded, and in another impiously rejected and despised? Do we not in one quarter behold the sacraments of the Redeemer profaned by unhallowed hands, and in another witness the total neglect and contempt of those most sacred and awful symbols of his love and mercy? Do we not see in one place children forbidden to approach their Lord and Master; and those innocent and unoffending objects of his love, whom he took into his arms and blessed, and concerning whom he declared, that of such is the kingdom of heaven, taken out of his bosom, and denied admission into his Church and covenant? Do we not in another quarter behold, and can we behold it without astonishment and horror! the divinity of the Son of God impiously decryed, and the Holy Ghost profanely made to sanction the effusions of ignorance, and nonsense, and folly—of hypocrisy, madness, and blasphemy? Do we not, in the deadly spirit of Heathenism, in almost every part, see daily sacrifices offered to Mammon and Ashtoreth—to gold and silver—to luxury and sensuality? Do we not see the incense of the heart, not ascending as it ought, in sacred fragrance to heaven; but descending, in dark and unhallowed fumes, towards the earth? Do we not see the daughters of men mixing themselves with the sons of God?—

the follies, the fashions, principles and practices of the world mixing and blending themselves with the precepts, and doctrines, and institutions of the gospel, and contaminating and polluting every thing round? Do we not perceive an open and avowed contempt of all discipline and authority—of all sacred order and government?—And can we be insensible of the corruption and deep depravity into which we are fallen? Is it not most evident, from hence, that the *temple* of our Redeemer is *defiled;* that his *Jerusalem* is no longer a city which is at unity with itself—that it is converted into a *Babel*, where no man understands his neighbour, where there is no longer one heart, or one mind, or one lip—where confusion has fixed his seat, and where, of consequence, the faith is no longer preserved in the unity of the spirit, nor in the bond of peace, (and surely I need not add) nor in *righteousness of life?* We intimately know and feel, that the *fruit* of that *forbidden tree*, is *moral death*—we daily experience it to be destructive of all righteousness, and holiness, and purity.

If this representation which I have given of the general state of Christianity in our country be *a true one;* and that it is so, I appeal to the clear and certain knowledge of every one who hears me; have we not reason to apprehend the displeasure of heaven, and that this holy temple, this city of the living God, which we have defiled, will be made an heap of stones? Have we not cause to fear that our light will become darkness, that we shall be given over to our own delusions, and left to perish in the ways of our own wickedness?

Stained and polluted with the same guilt with which other churches have been defiled, and through which they have perished, can we hope to escape? Shall we not in our turn, when our iniquities are full, *be also destroyed?* Surely it well becomes us to be admonished by their example, and while we have time left us for repentance, to avail ourselves of the mercy and long suffering of God!

We cannot but perceive the enormity of our guilt—our multiplied iniquities stand full before our face—our transgressions are as manifest as the light—they encompass us on every side—they meet us at every turn—they can neither be disguised nor palliated.

How they are to be remedied God alone can tell! That

Almighty Being who first brought this earth out of chaos is only equal to the task. He alone who said, let there be light, and there was light, can dispel this darkness, and bring peace, and order, and unity out of this confusion. He alone who can still the raging of the sea, and the unruly passions of men, can quiet the disorders, and heal the miserable distractions of his guilty and divided people.

That every good man should lament and mourn upon this occasion, and humble himself before God, is most fervently to be supplicated!—That they should all, from every quarter, exert themselves to the utmost, in what so nearly concerns the honour and interest of their Redeemer's kingdom, and the final happiness of men, is a duty that calls aloud upon them—is a duty too evident, too pressing and incumbent upon them all to admit of doubt, of hesitation, or delay.

To such men, under our Lord and Master, and the overruling operations of his Holy Spirit, we must look up in this hour of darkness and danger. If uniting in this great cause, they will all endeavour zealously to do their duty; if laying aside all prejudices and partiality, all prepossessions and self originated opinions, all temporal interest and motives, they will attend, as becomes the faithful disciples and followers of Christ, with sacred regard to the strait and narrow path pointed out by *him;*—if they will look with a pure and single eye to the advancement of his *glory* only—to the preservation of his faith—to the peace and unity of his Church—to that unanimity and charity, and *perfect communion* of all his saints, for which his latest and most fervent prayers were offered up to the Father; we shall soon perceive a very different order of things. If in the spirit of their Redeemer they would address their heavenly Father, that they might all be one, as he and his Son are one; and in simplicity of heart submit to his guidance and direction, we should soon begin to perceive among us the *beauty of holiness*—we should soon perceive the Spirit of God moving upon these waters; separating light from darkness; restoring peace, and order, and harmony—we should soon see the wanderers from his Church returning to their home, hastening and flocking back like doves to their windows—We should then, indeed, see a *New Jerusalem* coming down from heaven, resplendent and glorious, and hear the Sons of God shout for joy.

But as desireable as is this great and blessed event, I much fear it will not speedily be brought to pass. The strong prejudices of the human heart are too deeply rooted to be soon removed:—The perversities of the human mind, and the obliquities of the human understanding have been too long strengthened and confirmed by habitual indulgence to be soon corrected. Pride, self-conceit, and an over-weening opinion of their own wisdom have got such entire and unsuspected possession of the souls of men, that they can hardly be brought to give them up. And so fully established is the *assumption* of the right and liberty which they exercise to judge, and act, and determine for themselves in every case relative not only to this world, but to the world to come, that there is very little hope it will ever be relinquished, until some signal interposition of providence shall teach them more humility—until some great and *impressive calamity* shall bring them back to a sober sense of their own littleness, insufficiency, and dependence; and convince them, amidst their imaginary riches, that they are *wretched*, and *miserable*, and *poor*, and *blind*, and *naked*.

In the mean time, let us, my beloved brethren, who are members of this yet pure and uncorrupted part of the universal Church of our Redeemer, zealously hold forth our light to a benighted and bewildered world. Let us, as becomes her faithful followers and soldiers, exert ourselves to the utmost to promote his honour and glory, and to extend and advance his kingdom. And to that end we must remember, that it is not enough that we preserve the faith once committed to the Saints pure and undefiled—that it is not enough that we adhere with unshaken loyalty to his divine authority; to the established and sacred discipline, order, and government of his Church; but we must in all other things endeavour to become an example to others—we must let our light so shine before men that they may see our good works—we must let the light of our unsullied faith, the light of our Apostolical discipline and government, of our primitive order and unity, be so exhibited to the world, that the holiness and purity of our lives may be seen in it, to the glory of our Redeemer.

We are a city placed upon an hill, and which cannot be hid—we lie open to the view and observation of all around us; and

great and wonderful will be the influence of our light, and of our example.

If to our pure and holy faith—if to our divine and authoritative government—if to our orderly, beautiful, and heavenly form of public worship we add holy, pious, and exemplary lives—if when we enter into the courts of the Lord's house we offer pure and holy sacrifices—if we present before him the incense of the heart and the affections—if preserving ourselves pure and unspotted from the world, we sanctify and devote ourselves to his service—if we sanctify and reverence his Sabbaths and his sacraments—if we sanctify and reverence his holy name and his word—if we keep pure and undefiled his holy temples; in all things advancing our profession as becomes his disciples; what could we not atchieve? How gloriously should we advance our Redeemer's kingdom? How would our shining and burning light illuminate the darkness around, and consume and destroy every thing that *defiles* in this *temple of God?*

We are, indeed, my brethren, designed and preserved for great and most important purposes—and we must look with sacred and trembling regard both to our destination and conduct. In the present *confused*, distracted, and divided state of our Redeemer's kingdom, we of this Church are evidently made the *rallying* and *uniting point*—we are the *centre* from which the wanderers have gone forth in every direction; and to which they must finally return from every quarter, or there will be no end of their wanderings. Both the *dove* and the *raven* must take shelter in this *our ark*, out of which they went, or there will be no rest for the soals of their feet. The *standard* to which the scattered tribes of our *revolted Israel* must resort, that Jerusalem may again be at peace and unity in herself—must be erected *here*—upon this our holy hill of Sion!—Let that standard, therefore, be displayed, with gratitude, with reverence, and with awe; and let there be written upon it—*Holiness to the Lord!*

To you, my brethren, who will be the future worshippers in this holy place—who will come to offer your prayers, and praises, and thanksgivings in the courts of this now consecrated temple of the Lord, let me earnestly recommend a serious and solemn consideration of what has been said. Apply it, I en-

treat you, to the regulation both of your *private* and *public* conduct. Remember that, as Christians, as the disciples and followers of the *Holy Jesus*, ye are each of you bound to preserve himself pure and undefiled—that ye are each of you dedicated to the Lord—that ye are sanctified by the Spirit—that ye are made the temples of the Holy Ghost. Defile not yourselves, therefore, lest ye be destroyed.

Remember that this *house* is set apart, and solemnly dedicated to God! That it is now his temple—that it is holy!—Pollute it not; let it be kept pure and undefiled, lest he destroy both it and you.

When you assemble yourselves together here for his worship, let it be with the most sacred and reverential respect. Enter into this place as into the immediate presence of God and his holy angels. Let your hearts, and minds, and affections be turned to him. Leave the world behind you when you approach to meet your *Saviour* here. Let the fervency, and sincerity, and purity of your piety and devotion manifest the fear, and awe, and love, and reverence, and gratitude which you owe him—and let this your light be made manifest to all men, that it may be the *guiding star* to your Redeemer; that it may be the bright and blessed *conductor* of every wanderer into his Church and Kingdom.

This, Christians, is your most reasonable, and most bounden duty; if you neglect it, you will have every cause to apprehend his displeasure—you will have every reason to fear his justice and his judgments.

But while you live as children of the light, while you worship him in unity, in sincerity, and in truth—while you keep yourselves and his temple pure and undefiled, and walk in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless, you may rest assured of his goodness and mercy towards you—you may with confidence look forward to that most certain and most consolatory promise made to all his *faithful worshippers*, "That in all places where I record my name, I will *come unto thee*, and *bless thee*."

And may he ever bless you here—may he shower down his goodness and mercy upon you and yours—may he pour upon you the plentiful effusions of his holy spirit, to guide, preserve, and comfort you, while passing through this dangerous and trou-

blesome world—may he keep both your souls and bodies pure and undefiled; and finally bring you to his everlasting rest—to that never ending felicity and glory purchased for us by our blessed Redeemer. To whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory now and for evermore. Amen.

[*We invite the attention of our readers to the following treatise. It relates to some religious topics that are frequently, and with interest, discussed among Christians. Mr. Knox, the author, was a* Presbyterian *Minister, and resided for several years in this country, but afterwards removed to the West-Indies, and died on the island of St. Croix. In the following republication of his letter, the introduction, and some other sentences are omitted which were not essential to the argument; and a note to the introduction is incorporated with the letter.*]

A Letter to the Rev. Mr. JACOB GREEN, *of New-Jersey, pointing out some Difficulties in the Calvinistic Scheme of Divinity, respecting* FREE WILL, DIVINE DECREES, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, *&c. and requesting a Solution of them. By* HUGH KNOX, *Minister of the Gospel in the Island of Saba, in the West-Indies.*

[Continued from p. 262, and concluded.]

I NOW come briefly to consider the three concluding questions of your last letter.

Quest. 1. "Why do some persons think the Calvinistic doctrine consistent with a God of infinite love, &c. and others the contrary?—What is the reason why persons of *equal capacity*" (I should have liked the question much better if you had added, and of *equal piety* too) "have such different sentiments respecting the divine nature?"—I answer in brief (if you allow of the addition inserted in the *parenthesis*, and I think your charity must allow it)—Because this difference of sentiments, in these *deep*, *abstruse*, *metaphysical* matters, is a much less essential matter than we make it to be. Men, by poring long on one scheme of thought, get so in love with it, and contract such a high sense of its importance, that they imagine *truth*

must *stand* or *fall* with their beloved *hypothesis.* There is a bewitching pleasure in *excogitating schemes, linking them together, and bringing* them into form: and every man, or set of men are generally so attached to their own favourite scheme, that they are too apt to think that *they alone* have the truth; and that all others are *wrong, very wrong*, so far as they differ from *them*:—as in proportion to their zeal for what they suppose to be important truth, and the measure in which they have wrought themselves up into the love and admiration of their own favourite system; in the same proportion they will be zealous against all other systems, and will imagine them destructive of all true religion. Men of enlarged minds and universal reading cannot help seeing this truth but too clearly; and racks, tortures, inquisitions, and persecutions, are some of the sad fruits of this *narrow, engrossing, anti-catholic* spirit. Whereas, if the good GOD saw this diversity of sentiment in these matters to be so very *essential* and *important* as we make it to be, he would certainly *unite all his saints*, and make them of *one mind* in these things; and would by no means suffer those who love and serve him with all their hearts, and with the truest zeal, to continue under such *absurd, atheistical*, and *blasphemous* errors, as we affect to call them.

Of three men, equally intelligent, equally learned, equally pious, one is a *thorough Calvinist*, another a *moderate Calvinist*, and the third yet *more of an Arminian.* What is the reason? —why, these men have been accustomed from their infancy to read different authors, to hear and converse with men of different principles; and have been led to weigh and consider attentively different difficulties in religion; and hence (as well as from a number of other supposeable causes and motives) have been led to form to themselves different schemes of religion; yet all of them perfectly agree (yea, *must* agree) in every thing *truly essential.*

If I might be allowed to enlarge a little farther upon a subject, the abuse or misunderstanding of which, if I mistake not, has been the source of all uncharitableness among Christian brethren, I would hazard and endeavour to *support* and *illustrate* the following conjecture, viz. That error in opinion is unavoidable by man in the present state; and, so far as it is so, must be innocent.—Although *truth* is but *one*, that is, but *one*

of 10,000 different opinions concerning one object of knowledge, can be the *true opinion;* yet the objects of knowledge are next to infinite in their number. GOD, knowing himself, his perfections and works, has a *perfect*, *unerring* comprehension of all truth. But a very few objects of knowledge are revealed to men; and even amongst *these* many are too large for their limited capacities, and can be viewed by them only *superficially*, in *part*, and, as it were, *by peacemeal.* Among men also there is a great diversity of capacities, opportunities, and advantages for *discovering* and *discerning* truth. Hence it happens that different men are led to view the *same object* of knowledge in the *different parts* of it, and with *different degrees of advantage.* No man ever saw, or ever can see even all *knowable truths* in their full extent, and in the proper connection with each other, and dependence on each other. Hence it appears demonstrably, from the very nature of human infirmity and imperfection, that *men must* err in some respect or degree; and the more objects of speculation the human understanding is employed about, and the more sublime and incomprehensible these objects are in themselves, in the more instances it is still liable to err: in other words, errors are, as it were, necessarily multiplied by an increase of knowledge. Hence it will also follow, that as religion lays before the human understanding the *sublimest speculations* and the most *incomprehensible objects*, men will be more liable to error in their *religious opinions* than in any other. If it be said that *divine revelation* affords a sufficient remedy against error in religious opinions, as it exhibits a *perfect* and *unerring rule of faith;* I grant that this is strictly true, with regard to all those truths or objects of knowledge which are *essentially necessary* in order to the *duty* and salvation of sinners; otherwise *divine revelation* would be by no means adequate to the purpose for which it was given:—but that it is not equally true with regard to multitudes of *unessential matters*, which nevertheless are deemed *objects of religious knowledge*, and *subjects of religious speculation*, is abundantly evident from the differences of opinion among the best of men about these matters, in every succeeding age of the Christian Church. It is of the nature of the human mind to be *active*, *curious*, and *inquisitive;* and an increase of knowledge sharpens the appetite of the mind: in

plainer words; "the more we know, the more we desire to know." And there is no limits to this appetite: not satisfied with plain wholesome food; not satisfied with plain necessary truths that are clearly revealed, our curiosity and thirst of knowledge lead us to attempt the knowledge of the most difficult and incomprehensible matters; and that too in all their *causes*, *reasons*, *effects*, and various *bearings* and *dependencies*. This is not all; the human mind is delighted with beauty, symmetry, order, and proportion. It delights to arrange its ideas, and to make out and see the connection between truths; or how one truth depends on another. Hence the fondness for *theories*; for *schemes* or *systems* of truth. Now, from what has been said above of the imperfection of human knowledge, in *single* and *particular* objects, it will follow that men will be vastly more liable to err in *schemes* or *systems* of doctrines, where so much depends on the due connection of truths, than in any *single*, *detached* object of knowledge whatever. Yet men *must* have their systems, and consequently they *must err*. None but GOD, who knows all things in their natures, bearings, and dependencies, can make a system of truth *free from all error*. The Bible does not lay down divine truths *systematically*, and thereby seems to teach us that systems are not absolutely necessary for us: every man, therefore, if he will have a system, must arrange divine truths as well as he can, for himself. If it were to be narrowly inspected into, I am persuaded it would appear, that *no two* men upon earth have the same system of religious sentiments throughout; nor could conscientiously adopt and subscribe, *in the same sense*, any long set of religious articles: Therefore no one human system of religion can be right throughout. But such errors as necessarily arise from the infirmity and imperfection of the human mind, are certainly innocent. GOD, for wise and good purposes, permits these errors to take place; and is doubtless even glorified by these *unessential differences* of opinion; which, if debated with charity, candour, and moderation, are perhaps a profitable exercise of virtue, knowledge, genius, and diligence.

While you, for instance, plead for the sovereignty of GOD, according to your view of it, you mean to exalt the *divine glory* without intending any prejudice to the *divine justice* and *goodness*. While I plead for the *justice*, *mercy*, and *benevolence* of

GOD, according to my view of them, I mean to exalt the divine glory, without intending any prejudice to his *sovereign independency*. If I adopted your scheme without *your ideas* of the divine sovereignty, I should injure GOD in my heart, by thinking unworthily of him. If you adopted my scheme throughout, without *my ideas* of the divine justice, mercy, and benevolence, you would probably dishonour and offend the MOST HIGH in the same manner. Our ideas of these divine perfections must be radically changed before we could, with a good conscience, come wholly over to each other. Both of us, doubtless, err in some parts of our respective systems; yet both of us may be right in honestly endeavouring to promote the glory of GOD, according to our best view of things. Both of us, therefore, may be pleasing and honouring GOD to the best of our ability, and may be therefore *accepted* of him, and ought to exercise *mutual charity* to each other. If we cannot change one another's ideas in these matters, we cannot, *salvâ conscientiâ*, come over the whole way, one to the other. If we are honest, and yet, in any thing *essential* err, GOD will, doubtless, show it unto us. If our errors are *unessential*, GOD may leave us in them till death, and bring us together in the future world, where we shall *know*, and *harmonize in* the *true system* in its full extent.

When I conceive of the *great* GOD, and suffer my mind to dwell upon him but for a moment, I conceive of him as the most *just*, *holy*, *amiable*, and every way *adorable* Being: and when I would conceive of his exhibition of himself to his creatures, in his works of creation, providence, and redemption, I conceive of him as acting every way *worthy of himself*.—When, therefore, I would attempt to adopt a scheme of thought concerning his operations *ad extrâ*, and the plan of these operations as formed in his all-comprehensive mind before their coming into existence, I would incline to choose that which, upon the whole, seemed best to comport with my *highest* and most exalted idea of his *moral character*. Wherever any thing, in any scheme, seems to clash with this idea, or contradict it, I immediately reject this system, by whatever authorities supported;—not that I dare absolutely condemn such a scheme as *false* and *fundamentally erroneous*—seeing the error may lie in my own *conceptions* and *reasonings*; but in present circumstances I *must* reject it,

however true; because, to my apprehensions, it is inconsistent with infinite moral rectitude and excellence. So that, before I dare conscientiously adopt such a scheme, either my *idea* of *moral excellence* must be *altered*, or my *reasonings* from this idea *rectified*—in short, I must be *convinced of error*.

Quest. 2. Does GOD's foreknowledge depend on his decree; "or his decree upon his prescience?"—*Ans.* I do not know that the holy scriptures are decisive on this nice, metaphysical speculation. *Known unto* GOD *are all his works from the beginning of the world. Whom he foreknew, them he also predestinated*, &c.—Might I dare to give my opinion of this matter, I would venture to say that, perhaps, in some instances, GOD's foreknowledge may go before his decree; and that, in other respects, his decree may be supposed, in the order of nature, before his foreknowledge. I am loath to use the word *depend* upon this occasion. Besides, there is such an *unity* and *simplicity* in all the *internal* acts and operations of the DEITY, that we are in danger of falling into very erroneous blunders when we go about to distinguish them. However, as it is in some respects necessary, in order to help our conceptions of things, to consider *understanding* and *will* as two distinct faculties in the divine Being, and to distinguish between the *acts* and *exercises* of these two faculties; I think I can conceive of the MOST HIGH as *first willing* and *decreeing* to make an universe, inhabited by such and such ranks and orders of created beings, and designing his own glory and the greatest good of his creatures in so doing. I can then conceive of him as *fore-seeing* and *fore-knowing* what course such creatures would take, according to their respective natures, liberty, and circumstances. And then I can conceive of a *subsequent decree* to *over-rule*, *govern*, and *direct* the free actions and volitions of these creatures, so as that in the issue they may be made to subserve the purposes of his own glory, and the greatest possible good of the system. But indeed, *my dear Sir*, these are speculations so very *high* and *bold*, that the less we meddle with them, the less risk we shall run of *speaking presumptuously*, and of *darkening council by words without ideas*. Job xxxviii. 2.

Quest. 3. "If GOD should now create one or more moral agents, with all the freedom that ever creature had, and put them into a state of trial, so as to leave them in the greatest

equilibrium, could he foresee how these creatures would acquit themselves?"—*Ans.* Yes, certainly; otherwise his *prescience*, and consequently his *knowledge*, could not be *infinite*. I am not *Socinian* enough to deny the infinite and most perfect prescience of him *whose understanding is infinite;* the ONLY WISE GOD:—I think the fulfilment of prophecy, with regard to the volitions and actions of creatures whom I take to be in a state of proper moral agency, furnishes an irrefragable proof of this truth. Although the *quomodo* of this prescience is *too high for me; I cannot attain it;* yet I do not entertain the least doubt of it. I conceive that GOD made *Adam* thus; yet did he foresee his fall, and had a remedy in store before the foundation of the world. Nor can I guess what concession you would draw from me by this *query;* or what use you would make of it against my principles. I believe GOD so perfectly knows the natures of free agents, and the circumstances they are in, and what effect these circumstances will have upon them, as perfectly and unerringly to know the course they will take in consequence; while (which makes the grand difficulty in conceiving of this prescience) he knows at the same time, that they had it *in their power* to have taken a *different course*, and that in many instances they *ought* to have done so. As, therefore, this kind of foreknowledge has no manner of influence upon the conduct of such free agents, I believe that God may be perfectly justifiable in not interfering to prevent their taking the wrong course, which he *foreknew* they would take. Will you say that GOD's making such creatures, and putting them into such circumstances as he *foresaw* would *tempt* and *prevail* with them to apostatize, and giving them such a liberty as he *foreknew* they would abuse; is making their *fall* and *apostacy as necessary* as any *positive decree*, or *chain of external motives* whatever could have done;—and that, therefore, in the issue, my scheme will come to the very *same thing* with *yours*, and that of the most rigid *Calvinists?*—I think, not at all. The scheme of rigid Calvinists (if I understand it) supposes a *causal* necessity; mine only a *consequential* one. I cannot think of an event *positively decreed*, and brought to pass by *prevailing external motives;* but I must think of that event as brought into existence by a necessity of *influence* and *coaction;* that is, by a *fatal necessity*. But when, upon my scheme, I consider GOD

as putting a free agent into circumstances of trial, in which he foresaw he would abuse his liberty, while he was endued with a sufficient power to have made a glorious use of it, and to have acquitted himself well in his trial; I can see nothing in this state of the case, whereby GOD can be in the least chargeable with the *fall* or *apostacy* of such a free agent. The simple prescience of GOD can have no manner of influence on this event. The thing happened, indeed, just as GOD foresaw that it would; but it happened wholly by the fault of the creature, and *in the nature of things* it might not have happened. It did not happen *because* GOD *foresaw it;* but GOD foresaw it, because it *would happen.* I know it is scarce possible to speak on this subject with such *clearness* and *precision*, as to guard against the attacks of a subtle opponent; yet I think I have pretty clear ideas of a wide difference between my scheme and that which I oppugn.—But, be this as it will; it is God's providential dealings towards the unhappy, corrupt offspring of *such offenders*, who never abused this kind of liberty, nor *properly*, that is, *personally* demerited the divine displeasure, which I am concerned to vindicate against the principles of thorough Calvinists. Suppose such delinquents to be *spared*, and permitted to propagate their own kind, and replenish the earth with a *corrupt*, *helpless*, *miserable* progeny; the question with me is, How it becomes a GOD of infinite *power*, *wisdom*, *justice*, *benevolence*, *holiness*, and *mercy*, to deal with such his corrupt, helpless, miserable creatures?

Thus you see, *my dear Sir*, how *largely* and *freely* I have opened my whole soul before you, with all its errors, weaknesses, and infirmities. I have said, and I would have you to bear it in mind, that I have done it in the humble capacity of a *learner*, seeking the truth, and desirous to embrace it. If I am wrong, *pity* me, *instruct* and *correct* me, but do not exclude me from your charity. Believe me, at least, to be actuated by *simplicity* and undissembled *sincerity* in this exposition of my sentiments and doubts. I would not have thus *opened* and *retailed* myself but to a *friend*—a *candid*, *generous*, *intelligent*, *Christian* friend. Bigots would *anathematize* me for these sentiments; but you, *Sir*, have *more sense* and *more candour*. Your mind has been long conversant about these speculations: you well know their *depth*, and how difficult it is to form a right

judgment upon them; and, therefore, *can have charity* for those who are puzzled and perplexed in search of truth, through these aerial regions of *metaphysical speculation.* It is the happy privilege of those only who never thought *deeply* or *freely* about these matters, to find *no difficulty* in understanding them. Inquisitive, thoughtful men, who have knocked off the trammels of early prejudice, see a thousand perplexing difficulties where dull plodders on a system see all things *plain* and *easy*, all *truth* and *demonstration.*—Nor would even these good qualities in you have induced me to have been thus *circumstantial* and *undisguised*, were I not in hopes thereby of drawing from you, or the Rev. Mr. —— (to whom, with my love, I give you liberty to communicate this hasty, incorrect scrawl) a farther explanation of your scheme, and some solid answers to my objections against it.

But now, that this letter is about to be submitted to the public, the *author* foresees, without the spirit of prophecy, that he is like to procure himself abundance of enemies. Bigots among the *Calvinists* will call him an *Arminian;* and with them there is little difference between an *Arminian*, an *heretic*, and a *devil. Arminians*, on the other hand, will disclaim him, as too much a *Calvinist;* and with them there is little difference between a *Calvinist* and an *ideot.* As to those *poor narrow souls* of both sides who confine religion to *a party*, and who imagine that *piety* and *good sense* are their own property *exclusively;* the author, knowing them to be *short-sighted*, pities them, and holds their censure in contempt. He is much more concerned lest he should incur the displeasure of *his brethren* (whose judgment he venerates and respects, and whose persons he loves with the truest affection) by the *boldness* and *freedom* of some of his sentiments. He has reason, however, to hope that his apology for this will be deemed satisfactory. Be this as it may, the *die* is now cast; and after the maturest deliberation, he judges it best upon the whole to publish the letter.

* * * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * * *

You will perceive that I have observed little or no method in this letter, but have negligently and immethodically followed the train of my thoughts, wherever they have led me. I would not, however, wish you to imitate me in this. My difficulties

may be arranged under a very few heads, and distinctly answered; which will save much labour, while, at the same time, it will be more useful and edifying to,

Reverend and dear Sir,

Your very affectionate Brother
and obedient Servant,
HUGH KNOX.

A View of the Evidences of the Divinity of Christ, in several Sermons. By the Rev. CHRISTOPHER E. GADSDEN, *A. M. Deacon in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Minister of St. John's Parish, Berkley, South-Carolina.*

[Continued from Page 283.]

Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all.—Acts x. 36.

IN our first discourse on these words, it was argued that Christ was not a man; from unequivocal assertions of the sacred scriptures; and from the view of his conduct, fortune and divine commission with which those writings furnish us. The latter argument has not, however, been pursued to its full extent, nor as yet has its strongest positions been exhibited to you. Those circumstances in our Lord's history, which afford intimations of his being superior to man, have been briefly mentioned; while those more extraordinary ones, which appear absolutely incompatible with mere humanity, have been reserved for the concluding part of the argument. It remains, therefore, to mention these, and this we shall do as concisely as justice to their weight will permit.

That our Saviour had an existence prior to his appearance on earth, is a truth explicitly and repeatedly asserted in the Scriptures. He says of himself: "I came down from heaven; I proceeded forth and came from God; I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world." St. John vi. 38, viii. 42, xvi. 28. And, as if this fact was no longer questionable, he, on various occasions, makes allusions to it. "He that cometh from above is above all." St. John iii. 31. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before." Prov. vi. 62. For the truth of it, he makes an indirect, though solemn

appeal to the searcher of hearts: "O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was;" "for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." John xvii. 5, 24. The birth of Christ was a subsequent event to that of Abraham, of David, and of John the Baptist; yet he says of himself, "Before Abraham was I am." John viii. 58. "I am the root of David." Rev. xxii. 16. "He, i. e. Christ (says John) was before me." These declarations cannot be reconciled with truth but on the admission of his pre-existence. The same remark is applicable to the assertion of Micah, "His goings forth have been from everlasting," Micah v. 2; to that of the Apostle, "He hath neither beginning of days nor end of life," Heb. vii. 3; and to all those passages of Scripture which declare Christ's existence from all eternity, the introduction of which more naturally belongs to another part of our subject. The scriptural expressions, "He (Christ) took on him the seed of Abraham," Heb. ii. 16, "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," Rom. i. 3, "was made in the likeness of men," Philip. ii. 7, certainly point him out as not naturally man, but a being on whom the human nature had been superinduced. Such is the evidence of our Saviour's existence prior to his incarnation. If it appears to you satisfactory, and I apprehend it cannot but appear so, you will at once perceive it to be a legitimate conclusion from this fact, that he was not a mere man.

The scriptures which acquaint us with the attributes of the Deity give us a no less faithful representation of the human character. Hence that depravity, which, from the earliest ages, has been known and lamented by philosophy, which has been the scourge of our race, is not concealed by them. It is, alas! the most prominent feature in our moral portrait. Attend, Christians, to the testimony of inspired men: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. li. 5. "There is no man that sinneth not." 1 Kings viii. 46. "There is none that doeth good, no not one." Rom. iii. 12. "The scripture hath concluded all under sin." Gal. iii. 22. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." 1 John i. 8. "How (saith Job ix. 2, 3,) should man be just with God; if he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand." "What is he (Job xv. 14,)

which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous—(verse 61) How abominable is man, who drinketh in iniquity like water. "Who (saith Solomon, Prov. xx. 9.) can say, I have made my heart clean?" "There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." Eccles. vii. 20. Thus frequently, explicitly and variously is the doctrine of human depravity asserted in the sacred writings. Yet is it the declaration of these same writings that Christ, though "in all points tempted like as we are, was without sin." Heb. iv. 15. "He is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." Heb. vii. 26. "In him is no sin." 1 John iii. 5. "He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." 1 Peter ii. 22. He is styled emphatically "Jesus Christ the righteous," 1 John ii. 1. "a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 Peter i. 19.

Conformably to these declarations in the whole history of Christ, no instance of his committing sin is to be found. If his life had indeed furnished one, it is not to be supposed that it would have escaped the attention of his cotemporaries. His eagle-eyed enemies would have been forward in censuring it, and proclaiming it to the world; and the fidelity of his biographers would not have permitted them to conceal it. Can it for a moment be supposed that those evangelists who so often mention the failings of those who were connected with the object of their narrative, who so ingenuously *proclaim* their own sins whenever the illustration of the history renders it necessary, would have omitted intentionally whatever might be derogatory to their Master? Their tried integrity, no less than their intimacy with Christ, and the accuracy of their narration forbid us to believe that their silence as to our Saviour's guilt could have proceeded from any other circumstance than that he was absolutely free from it. Your Saviour then, Christians, is represented as possessing sinless perfection by that same revelation which "concludes all men under sin." Is it not hence a necessary inference—let the appeal be made to your unbiassed judgments—that he was not a man? If this be denied, the authenticity of the passages above quoted must also be denied. There is no other alternative.

But there is yet a more important view of this subject. If Christ had been a man he could not have executed the great object of his mission. We are told that "God sent his Son

to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John ii. 2. ibid. iv. 10. and Rom. iii. 25. and accordingly that he " was sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. v. 7. To say nothing of the irrationality of the idea that a man would have been entrusted with so important a commission, it is certain that no human being, without a radical change of his nature, an incalculable increase of his moral ability, could have discharged it. Had Christ been a mere man, he must, as has been fully shown, have partaken of man's sinful nature. In this case, his sufferings how aggravated soever, could not have been expiatory even of his own sins, much less of the sins of others. The afflictions to which he was subjected would have been the just forfeit of his guilt; even death itself would have been demanded as the penalty of his personal transgression. If that divine justice which exacts the punishment of all sinners can be satisfied by the vicarious suffering of one being, it can only be by that of a guiltless being. How can he be a surety for others whose creditor, whose debt, and whose means of discharging it are the same with theirs? The debtor must satisfy his creditor on his own account before he can undertake to do it in behalf of a brother debtor. Sinless perfection must necessarily be the attribute of a mediator between God and man. Correspondently to this idea is that declaration of St. John iii. 5. " He (Christ) was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." Our Saviour then, to the due execution of his mediatorial office, must have been free from the least tincture of moral guilt; of course, of a nature superior to man.

I shall mention only one additional characteristic of our Saviour, which is incompatible with the idea that he was a mere man. The prophet Haggai does by the judgment of all, allude to him in that remarkable passage wherein he says, " The glory of this latter house (i. e. the second temple) shall be greater than of the former." Hag. ii. 9. In support of this opinion it is with propriety urged, that as to external grandeur and beauty, no comparison could be instituted between the first and second temple. So great was the superiority of the former, that the comparative insignificancy of the latter, evidencing as it did the change which the affairs of the Jews had undergone, is said to have drawn tears from the eyes of some of those aged members of the community who had flourished in the time of their country's prosperity. (Ezek. iii. 12.) The conclusion hence drawn

that the greater glory of the second temple consisted in Christ's having honoured it with his presence, is correct only on the supposition that he is not a man. Deny this and you reduce this glory to nothing; or, at least, its superiority to that of the first temple immediately becomes questionable. This had been frequented by some of the most eminent servants of heaven; angels had more than once entered its precincts; in every other respect than that of Christ's appearance in it, it was more glorious than the latter temple. But if Christ be a man, the supereminence of the second temple is at once annihilated; that of the first cannot be doubted, and the authenticity of Haggai's declaration becomes suspicious. I trust no reasonable mind will hesitate to adopt the other alternative, that the prediction of the prophet has been strictly fulfilled, and, of course, that Christ is not a man. In proof of this fact, his pre-existence, his freedom from guilt, his mediatorial office, and his glory asserted by the prophet Haggai, have been severally urged.

The second proposition which we design to endeavour to establish now claims our attention. It will be our object to show that Christ could not have been an angel. This appears, 1st, from unequivocal declarations of Scripture. "He took not on him the nature of angels." Heb. ii. 16. "Being made so much better than the angels as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Heb. i. 4. "For unto which of the angels said he (i. e. God) at any time, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." Verse 5. The Apostle's object here to convince the Hebrews of Christ's superiority to angels cannot be mistaken. These passages, therefore, alone would on this head be conclusive.* No evil however can result from a full exhibition of the evidence in support of any scriptural truth. We proceed, therefore, to add that as our Saviour's history furnishes intimations of his not being a man, so does it of his not being an angel.

It scarce need be repeated, that both under the patriarchal and Jewish œconomy, the advent of the Messiah was the great object of expectation and hope. This was the promise made

* The same remark is applicable to his argument in another place: "If the word (says he) spoken by *angels* was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at first began to be spoken by the Lord," &c. Heb. ii. 2, 3.

by God to our fathers. This was not merely the greatest but almost the only end of prophetic instruction. With a view to this was the ceremonial law and its magnificent apparatus instituted, and by this were they to be abrogated. In proportion as the event drew near, the harbingers of it were more numerous and more extraordinary. Hence, when he entered the world, he did no more than justify its anticipations. This universal expectation is alone convincing evidence that Christ was ushered on the stage of human life, by circumstances of a very peculiar nature. Angels, as their name might teach us, are the messengers of the Almighty. During the Mosaic dispensation, and still more frequently during the patriarchal, they were sent on errands to man; but no inspired language, as typical action, announced their coming, no special messenger preceded it. They came unexpectedly. They sometimes worked miracles. But they did not agitate universal nature. They did not ascend to heaven triumphantly. In short, their mission was not distinguished like that of Christ, by unheard of events in the animate and inanimate world. Their deportment too marked their inferiority to Christ. They spoke and acted on all the occasions with which we are acquainted, in a manner totally dissimilar. The familiarity with which Christ discoursed of God and heaven has already been noticed as a peculiarity which distinguishes him from all other human messengers of heaven; it may be added that it no less distinguishes him from angels, those superior beings whom God has frequently employed as his messengers. We read that these, when they worship God, seated on the throne, fell upon their faces (Rev. vii. 11.) as if unable to sustain the majesty of his presence. It appears then that to the Angels, this ineffable glory was as novel as to mere men. Although then the Scriptures do not exhibit them as discoursing about God and heaven, we may conclude from this circumstance, that had they done so, they would have exhibited the same disproportion between the subject and the capacity of the speaker that men did. They would have, in this respect, differed from Christ no less than did the apostles. On the mount of transfiguration, the divine glory excited in the minds of the apostles a terror similar to that of the angels. They too fell on their faces. But in *Christ* it produced no such emotion.

Even should the correctness of this conclusion be understood,

there remains abundant evidence that Christ spake not merely as never man spake, but as never angel spake. "I am sent (says the angel Gabriel) to speak unto thee." St. Luke i. 19. "For judgment (says Christ) I am come into this world—I am come not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." Matt. ix. 13. How different is the personal authority with which the one and the other speaks! Gabriel does not presume to declare as from himself the good tidings with which he was charged; he delivers them in the capacity of a mere messenger. The same distinction of dignity is observable in their expressions; "I (says the one) am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God;" "I (says the other) am the light of the world." John viii. 12. "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."

The angels' manner of acting, no less than their speech, marked an inferiority to Christ. His miraculous powers seem to have been uncontrolled and unlimited. Not so those of angels.* To the angel who was destroying Jerusalem, God said, "It is enough, stay now thine hand: and he put up his sword again into the sheath thereof." 1 Chron. xxi. 15, 27). The sacred writings never suffer us to lose sight of the idea that Angels are mere agents of the Almighty. "The Lord, say they, sent an Angel which cut off all the mighty men of valour," &c. 2 Chron. xxxii. 21. The errands on which these beings are sent are universally limited, seldom embracing more than a single object. Thus the Angel who was sent to Zechariah, after having delivered his message, "went forth, and behold another angel went out to meet him, and said unto him, Run, speak to this young man, saying," &c. It would appear here as if heaven were unwilling to confide at

* The miracles performed by the one and the other at the pool of Bethesda are a remarkable exemplification of this truth. We are told by the Evangelist (in John v. 3, 4,) that at a certain season, the waters of that pool were troubled by an angel, immediately after which whosoever first entered was cured of any malady with which he might be afflicted. The angel's power here evidently appears limited, and that in many respects. It was only at a certain season that *he* could perform the miracle—the troubling of the water was an indispensable instrument of the cure—one person only could receive the benefit of it. Christ came to the same pool; he saw there a man who had been infirm thirty-eight years—his power of working miracles was a permanent one; it could be executed at any period—it could operate indifferently without instruments—he therefore instantly healed the cripple, without agitating the water, and requiring the patient, what in his present condition was almost impracticable, to be the first that leapt in it. There is a marked difference between the conduct of Christ and the Angel, obviously indicating a superiority of the former.

one time more than one commission to an angel, after the execution of which another was committed to him. How obviously superior in this respect Christ is, need not be repeated. The view of his offices to which we were led in our last discourse will remind you how decidedly the contrast is in his favour. Here is at least an intimation that this greatest of moral teachers was not an angel.

His Judgeship and Mediatorial office are still stronger intimations of this fact. The Angels are, we read, to be judged by our Lord; and if, as we remarked on a former occasion, it be incongruous to suppose that man should be the judge of the eternal destiny of his fellow men, it is no less so that an Angel should judge his fellow angels. Reason too would seem to suggest that an angel was not adequate to the execution of that great work of redemption. There is much plausibility in the idea that sin is an infinite evil; if so, an infinite being alone can atone for it. At any rate, the disproportion between the suffering of any creature, however exalted, and the mass of suffering which, divided among the myriads of the human race, would have been inevitable but for the propitiation, is immense, and the presumption of course strong, that Christ was not an angel.* The glory ascribed to the second temple by Haggai, in consequence of Christ's appearance in it, is an intimation to which the same remark is applicable. For if Christ be not superior to an angel, his appearance in the temple could have conferred no supereminent honour on it. The first temple had been honoured with the presence, not of one, but of many angels; so that, to say the least, it was perfectly on a footing with the second, as to the dignity of its guests, if our Lord is to be ranked among angels. To consider him one of this number is then to invalidate the prophecy of Haggai, no less effectually than to consider him a mere man. In the scriptures we frequently find such expressions as these: "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all* the holy angels with him." Matt. xxv. 31. It is said, "of that day (meaning the judgment day) knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son." Mark xiii. 32. "Ye received me

* The mysteries of redemption are said by St. Peter, 1 Eph. i. 12, to be things which the "angels desire to look into." An assertion not easily reconcileable with the idea that the Redeemer is an angel.

(says St. Paul to the Galatians, iv. 14) as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus." Each of these passages, and many more which might be recited, are absolutely tautology on the supposition that Christ is an angel; but they imply more than a mere difference of nature between him and angels, they lead us to view him as superior to them. We are led to a similar conclusion by the fact that angels are constantly represented as ministering to Christ. To his mother and supposed father they announced his conception; they proclaimed his birth to the shepherds, and united in their joy for this event. During his temptation in the wilderness they " ministered to him;" and on the cross he assures us an expression of desire from him would immediately summon to his aid more than twelve legions of these spiritual beings. His resurrection and ascension were both attended by these angelic spirits. They now wait on him in the kingdom of glory; for, saith the apostle, " he is on the right hand of God; *Angels*, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him." They shall be with him as subordinate agents at the great day of judgment. " The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, (1 Thess. i. 7, and John i. 51) and these shall sever the wicked from among the just (Matt. xiii. 49.) And they are, and, while time lasts, will be his ministering spirits on earth, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." Heb. i. 14. Their subserviency to him will continue throughout eternity. For, saith St. John, they stand before the Lamb, are placed at the gates of that spiritual city of which he is the light, and are employed in praising him. Rev. vii. 11, and xxi. 12, 23. Conformably to this representation of angels holding to Christ the relationship of servants, they are called " his angels." The frequent use of this epithet is worthy of being remarked. They are " his angels," whom he " shall send forth to gather out of his kingdom them which do iniquity." Matt. xiii. 41. " His angels who are to gather together his elect from the four winds." Matt. xiii. 27. The Son of man is to come in the glory of his Father with " his angels." Matt. xvi. 27. It was an angel of Jesus Christ who signified his revelation to his servant John, (Rev. i. 1.) and our Lord expressly calls this person " mine angel."

The evidence of the fact that Christ was with his permission, to say the least, worshipped, will more properly be introduced

under another head of discourse; we cannot, however, avoid observing *here*, that this circumstance furnishes the most satisfactory proof that our Lord was not an angel. The Colossians are particularly cautioned against "worshipping of angels." (Col. ii. 18) And St. John, who fell down to worship one of these angelic spirits, met with this pointed rebuke from him, "See thou do not, for I am thy fellow-servant; worship God." Rev. xxii. 9. It may be added, that the worship of our Lord is explicitly required of angels. "Let all the angels of God worship him," saith St. Paul. This circumstance is surely incompatible with the idea that he is an angel.

The humble Christian knows that our Lord is never in the scriptures called an angel; that these writings abound with intimations and explicit declarations that he is not; that all the actions of Christ, and the events of his life mark him out as superior to angels. To such an one the minute detail of the evidences of these facts, which we have now completed, may appear superfluous. It is proper, therefore, to observe, that among the various heresies which have disgraced and injured the Christian cause, that of our Saviour's being an angel is one. The design of substantiating our text, of proving Christ's claim to divinity, naturally led to a consideration of the two opposite doctrines—that he is a man, and that he is an angel.

It is fondly hoped that the arguments which have been briefly recited to you in this and our last discourse have satisfied you that these doctrines are unsupported by reason or by revelation. Agreeably to the course originally pointed out, the subject will be still farther pursued. The negative evidence of the important truth, that "Jesus Christ is Lord of all," having been explored, the positive will next come under review. With the blessing of heaven, we indulge the hope that we shall be able to prove conclusively, not only that Christ is not a man, and not an angel, but that he is God over all, blessed for ever.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[*We beg the Correspondent who favoured us with the following ingenious and interesting Communication to accept our thanks. We have also been favoured, by another valuable correspondent, with several original letters which passed between the writer of the ensuing observations and Dr. Johnson, the first President of King's, now Columbia College; and also between this latter gentleman and some of the most distinguished literary and religious characters of his day, in Great-Britain, and in this country. We shall commence the publication of these with the first number for the ensuing year. And as they contain much curious information, and many valuable remarks on literary and theological subjects, we doubt not they will prove interesting to our readers.*]

Observations on Mr. Whitfield's answer to the Bishop of London's Pastoral Letter; addressed by CADWALLADER COLDEN, *Esq. formerly Lieutenant-Governor of New-York, to his daughter* DE L——

IF Mr. Whitfield's answer to the Bishop of London's Pastoral letter be considered as a matter of controversy only, it must be allowed, that he has managed it with a great deal of art. The arguments are concisely framed, the words well chosen, and placed with great skill in their periods, and applied with all their force. It must be allowed that he is a dexterous disputant. But as you desire my opinion more particularly of this performance, in order to assist your own judgment, you know I cheerfully comply with every desire that may be of use to you, and you must be persuaded, that I have no other end in doing it. For this purpose I will make some observations on such parts of his answer as seem to me most material.

He finds fault with the Bishop's definition of *Enthusiasm*, viz. *That it is a strong persuasion on the mind, that they are guided in an extraordinary manner, by immediate impulses and impressions of the spirit of God.* Mr. Whitfield, if I understand him right, will have it, that this strong persuasion is sufficient evidence to the person that has it; though it be not so to others.

It is well known, that hypochondriac people have sometimes fancied themselves kings, and have had all the joy, inward complacency and delight, that could attend such a state had it been real. May not an hypochondriacal person as well fancy himself a prophet, and to be immediately inspired by the Holy Spirit? May he not take all the impressions made on a sickly brain to be the immediate impulses and impressions of the Spirit of God; and may he not take the same delight and complacency in the wild and extravagant visions of a deleterious head, that a sound mind can have in the most certain realities? There have been innumerable instances of such. I think therefore the Bishop cannot be blamed, when he thinks that some further guidance is necessary, to the person who imagines that he has such extraordinary impulses, before he can safely rely on them as divine. And that when the person has no other guidance, but a strong persuasion only, he has reason to fear, that they are the mere effects of enthusiasm, or of a fanciful or sickly brain. I must believe, with the Bishop, that the man who has no other evidence for his being divinely inspired but the force of his own imagination, and the delight and complacency he takes in his dreams and visions, is really and truly an enthusiast.

The wildest enthusiasts that ever appeared in the world, pretended to this inward delight and complacency in their extravagant notions. They declared themselves ready to suffer for them, and did often really suffer for them. What could tempt them to suffer, but the inward complacency and delight they really had in their imaginations?

But beware of thinking that I apply this to Mr. Whitfield; for I know not what further evidences he has. I only speak of the justness of the Bishop's definition of enthusiasm, which Mr. Whitfield blames as faulty.

The next thing I shall take notice of, is Mr. Whitfield arraigning the Bishop of preaching another gospel than that of Jesus Christ, when the Bishop says, that good works are a necessary condition of our justification, or, which I think the same thing, of our being saved: unless we make the essentials of religion to consist more in nice school distinctions of words than in realities. Now, in my opinion, the Bishop can well justify this from scripture: for what other meaning has the parable

of the fig tree? St. Luke xiii. 6. *I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down.* So St. Paul to the Hebrews xii. 14. *Follow peace with all men, and holiness,* WITHOUT WHICH *no man shall see the Lord.* St. James i. 26, 27. *If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain. Pure religion and undefiled, before God and the Father, is this; to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.* Chap. ii. verse 19. *What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works; can faith save him?* &c. Read on to the end of the chapter. The work of repentance is made a necessary condition to salvation, by all the Prophets and Apostles, and by Christ himself. Doth not the Bishop speak the language of the Apostles and of Christ himself? How comes it then, that Mr. Whitfield charges him, for that very reason, of preaching another gospel than that of Jesus Christ? I have been the more particular in this, because it is an error and enthusiasm that spreads in this part of the country, and is like to be of dangerous consequence to people's morals. We have a set of people, that call themselves the new born, and pretend to a spirit of discerning; that is, who not only are assured of their own election, but arrogantly determine that others are reprobate. These people are slothful in their business; but go about spreading divisions in families, between children and parents, man and wife; are open, bare-faced liars; and some of them are charged with manifest perjuries. These kind of sects and enthusiasts have prevailed in several parts, and openly practised abominable lewdness. Many instances can be given of the ill consequences of these enthusiastical notions. The Bishop certainly then had good reason to warn his people against doctrines which have such dangerous tendency over the minds of weak and ignorant people.

The style of the several Prophets and Apostles in their writings is evidently according to their learning and education. So Saint Paul, who was bred up at the feet of Gamaliel an eminent lawyer, explains the principles of the Christian religion often in law terms, because they were most familiar to him: such as justification and adoption, which every one knows are terms of the civil law. And so Mr. Whitfield takes the word condition

in a law sense, as when used in conveyancing. Hence young men of learning and warm imaginations are fond of explaining these doctrines according to the subtle distinctions and abstracted notions found in law books, and in the writings or schools of platonic philosophers, and thereby have turned the heads of many ignorant people; whereas in truth, nothing is more certain than that the principles of religion are not adapted to the learned only, but to the capacities of the unlearned, or those who have no more advantages than of common sense and reason. It is of these subtle raw scholars, who began so early as the Apostles' times, that St. Peter means, speaking of St. Paul's epistles, "*In which*," he says, "*are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*" 2 Peter iii. 16.

The Bishop asks him, (if I understand it right, for I have not seen the Pastoral letter,) by what commission or authority he breaks through the rules and orders of that Church, of which he professes himself a member? Mr. Whitfield, I am afraid, a little too artfully and slily evades the question, in answering generally by what commission he preaches the gospel. The satirical smartness used against the Bishop, though covered with smooth and oily words, when his Bishop makes a demand, which he certainly has right and authority to make, and which Mr. Whitfield evades, though he, a Presbyter under the Bishop, in duty ought to answer it in the fullest, directest and plainest manner possible, will not give to thinking men the best opinion of Mr. Whitfield's candour and ingenuity. All the direct answer which Mr. Whitfield gives, so far as I can collect it from his general answer, is this: That he has a strong impulse upon his mind to preach in the manner he does, the great complacency and delight he takes in the performance of it, and the extraordinary effects it has upon his hearers. What is this more, in plain English, than I have a strong inclination to do it; I am fond of it; and I take a great deal of pleasure in doing it; and, therefore, I have a right to break through the rules of the Church of which I am a member. Can this satisfy any cool thinking man; and is it not more likely to make a sober man think, that it proceeds from a warm imagination and a vast self-sufficiency?

As to the effects it has upon his hearers, did not Demosthenes,

Cicero, and many more profane orators, carry the multitude before them, like the waves of the sea driven by a strong wind? And yet no man ever thought these orators were assisted by any divine influence. If orations and sermons work only on people's imaginations and passions, certainly there is nothing supernatural in it; but if they work upon their lives and conversations, if they turn them from wicked to new and good dispositions and habits, then I will allow the influence to be divine and extraordinary. But, as to Mr. Whitfield, there has not been time sufficient to judge in this manner.

I come now to consider the spirit with which Mr. Whitfield writes to his Bishop. Though it be difficult to form any certain judgment of what is in any man's heart, yet, in this case, we cannot help making some judgment of it: for from this chiefly we form our good or ill opinion of the man. We have no other rule than this to see how he keeps up to the spirit, which he professes to have, page 2 of his Answer, viz. *that love and meekness which becomes a disciple of Jesus Christ, and with all that humility and reverence, which is due from a Presbyter to a Bishop of the Church of God.* When one endeavours to expose any person, for whom the generality of his hearers or readers have a respect, but more especially when, in common manners, the person who writes ought to treat him with respect, if he should neglect to do it, he would certainly fail of his design. If such profession be mere artifice, it must be done with such exquisite art, that it cannot be easily discerned; otherwise, when in the least discovered, it prejudices every reader at once against every thing that can be said, by reason of the evident hypocrisy. I must own that Mr. Whitfield has, either really, or very artificially, guarded against this prejudice; yet I think there is room, to a near observer, to suspect him of some artifice in his conduct in this respect. It is very difficult for the most artful actor, when he personates a character not natural to him, always to keep up to it. The natural character will now and then at unawares break out; and it is only by such casual dropping of the mask that the true face of a skilful actor can be discovered. Mr. Whitfield, I think, has given reason to suspect something of this, when he charges his Bishop in such express terms with preaching a new gospel, different from what the Apostles preached, and upon such slight

grounds as I have before observed. But this observation becomes much stronger in page 26 of his Answer, where he evidently exposes his Bishop in plain express terms. It is true, he, by a well known artifice in rhetoric, when he could not with any decency put the words in his Bishop's mouth, suddenly turns from him, and utters them from his own. But it is too plain that in this he designedly personates the Bishop, and designs that every person should apply it, and executes his design so effectually, that every reader does apply to the Bishop these words, which Mr. Whitfield cries out, *Oh, my leanness, my leanness!* He calls himself the Bishop's son, and this is certainly an exposing of, or an endeavour to expose his father's weakness, or nakedness. He ought to have considered the fate of Ham in such like case. But, in my opinion, what he says in the end of the 29th page, and beginning of the last, goes the farthest to make one doubt of his filial love and reverence for his spiritual father, notwithstanding all his professions to the contrary; when he says, *And as for your Lordship's suspicions, for your Lordship's sake I would not mention them.* If he had that regard for his Lordship he pretends, he would have passed them over in absolute silence, at least, without adding *for his Lordship's sake.* As I never saw the Bishop's Pastoral Letter, I cannot tell what the Bishop has been guilty of, which Mr. Whitfield, out of his filial love and reverence for his Bishop, seems to be desirous to bury in silence: But after the freedom Mr. Whitfield has taken with him, as to the Essex trials of religion, and after the exclamation of *Oh, my leanness*, I am apt to think that it must be a very gross and shameful failing in the Bishop: and as few of the readers of Mr. Whitfield's answer (in America at least) can have, or will take any opportunity of seeing what it is that Mr. Whitfield blames in such tender terms, they will certainly think as I do. And Mr. Whitfield gives ground to believe, that he designed they should think so; whereas, in reality, it may be a mere peccadillo, or it may be something Mr. Whitfield could not otherwise answer, than by this sly turn which he has given it. In short, this is such a common and successful figure in rhetoric, that every ill-natured person uses it, when he has a mind to slander a neighbour. Upon the whole of this answer, I think it appears evidently, that a son full of love,

of reverence, and respect for a father, would never have answered his father in the terms Mr. Whitfield has done, and published it to the world. Real love, reverence, and humility certainly would have produced another manner of writing. So that, I am afraid Mr. Whitfield has evidently prevaricated in this pretence, and if so, he as certainly has not been guided by the immediate influence of the Divine Spirit in answering his Bishop as he has done.

It is not from this that I would conclude that Mr. Whitfield is a bad man, or an hypocrite. No, all men, the best of men have their failings. Young men of uncommon parts and of considerable learning, who have a lively, strong imagination, and but little experience in the world, are apt to be conceited of themselves, and may really believe that these abilities they admire in themselves are truly the effect of some supernatural power; and thereby are exposed to most dangerous and most extravagant delusions. Mr. Whitfield, I am told, is a comely personage, has a well tuned voice, is perfectly skilled in all the parts of education, has a lively imagination, and a natural genius for oratory, improved with learning: such a man, with some more experience, and wise zeal, will certainly be an exceeding useful man in the world. But if, through spiritual pride, he arrogate to himself the supernatural assistance of the Divine Spirit, and attribute all the delusions of a fanciful brain to its immediate assistance, and can persuade others to believe as he does, such a man, with all these natural and acquired abilities, becomes a very dangerous person. If he can persuade you that he is immediately sent of God, that he is in all he preaches supernaturally assisted by the Holy Spirit, what is it he cannot afterwards persuade you to believe? And what is it he may not persuade you to do? There are too many instances of otherwise discreet people, under the force of such delusions, that have been persuaded to believe the wildest and most extravagant dreams, and that have been drawn away into the most shameful actions. No man can be too cautious in believing or trusting to these supernatural pretences. The person pretending to them must be *again* and *again* tried, not only by his doctrine and words, but by his life and conversation, before any trust of this kind can be put in him: and his trial cannot be the work of a few days.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[*The writer of the following Essay is evidently animated by a laudable desire to correct the false taste which very generally prevails in regard to* CHURCH MUSIC; *and to substitute the simple, dignified, and solemn music of the composers of the* Old School, *in the place of that light, quick, and "merry" music of some* modern *composers, which is totally unsuitable to the "service of the sanctuary." We wish his judicious remarks may receive the attention which they merit. As he alludes to some contemplated regulations of the Convention of the Church in the State of New-York on this subject, it may be proper to premise that there is no intention on the part of this body, of* prescribing *certain tunes to the exclusion of all others. The policy of such a measure, to say the least, would, on many accounts, be very questionable. We are of opinion, also, that, admitting the policy, no* State *Convention of the Church possesses the* right *to* legislate *on this subject. Such a right would interfere with the* paramount *authority of the General Convention, who, in the preface to the Psalms of David in metre, set forth by them, have made it "the duty of* every Minister *to give* order *concerning the tunes to be sung at any time in* his *Church." The book of Common Prayer, therefore, to which the Ministers of the Church solemnly promise to conform, vests the regulation of the Music "with the Minister of every Church." And only the General Convention, the authority which set forth that book, is competent to make a different order on this subject. All that is contemplated by the Convention of the Church in New-York is the* recommendation *of certain psalm tunes, chaunts, &c. And it is presumed that this recommendation will have such weight with every Minister, as to lead him* gradually *and* prudently *to introduce the Music thus recommended into his Church. For the same supreme authority of the Church which makes it his duty to "give order concerning the tunes to be sung," makes it also "his duty to suppress all light and unseemly Music; and all indecency and irreverence in the performance; by which vain and ungodly persons profane the service of the Sanctuary."*]

OBSERVATIONS ON CHURCH MUSIC.

IT must afford pleasure to all who are desirous of having the worship of God conducted in the "beauty of holiness," to learn that the Convention of the Church in this State have thought proper to direct their attention towards the regulation of the music in our church-service. Owing to want of attention, the singing in many of our Episcopal Churches, particularly in this State, has long been notoriously defective. But, in many congregations, even where great pains have been bestowed upon psalmody, an abuse prevails which is deserving of the severest animadversion. A strange fondness is manifested for those light and otherwise faulty psalm-tunes which are a disgrace to religion. The tunes in question are composed by singing-masters in our own country, and are as destitute of musical science as of solemnity and propriety. Indeed, so thorough an ignorance of the principles of harmony do these compositions in general betray, as to render it evident, that whatever in them is right must be the effect of chance and not of knowledge. But, independent of what may be called their *grammatical* errors, the style of these compositions is so mean and familiar, that, instead of being calculated to raise the affections to heaven, they seem intended to insult the ear and debase the soul. In all addresses to the Deity, even the most animated and joyful strains should be tempered by reverence; our mirth should be an "awful mirth:" but our American psalm-tunes are absolutely, and almost without exception, devoid of every trace of religious awe or devotion; and nothing but inveterate habit, and a most vitiated taste, could ever render them tolerable to a musical ear, or to a devout mind. For such strains as these, the compositions of the best European masters are, in many of our churches, entirely neglected; or, if occasionally admitted into the service, they are mangled and distorted by the licentious presumption of our domestic composers. And, in order to give these home-manufactured tunes their full effect, it is very usual, in the country churches, for a number of young people to associate themselves under some instructor; and, on Sundays, to appear in a body in some conspicuous part of the church; where they almost literally "sing

psalms to horn-pipes" for the entertainment of the rest of the congregation.

With regard to the introduction of chanting, it is to be hoped that much discretion will be used. And among other considerations which claim the attention of those who are to regulate this part of the service, the nature of our language should certainly not be disregarded. Some languages, even in common discourse, seem to be so nearly allied to recitative, that, upon occasions which require unusual pomp or solemnity, they, without effort, run into musical strains. We have heard of a Roman orator who placed a flute-player behind him, in order to give him the proper tones during his oration. Dionysius, in his celebrated treatise on composition, mentions the musical intervals heard in the ordinary pronunciation of Greek. And any person who has an opportunity of hearing a modern Italian read, may easily perceive that he utters his words with much greater variety of musical tone than would be expressed by an Englishman or American. These instances serve to show that some anguages have a closer alliance than our own with music; and, of course, may admit, and even be assisted by, music in circumstances where to us it would seem very unsuitable. Hence, it may appear a matter of less surprise that the Bramins in the East should at this day chant the precepts of their sacred law; and that the Jews should, in like manner, chant the books of Moses; which practice, among the latter, has been handed down from the earliest ages, and, doubtless, in the estimation of their forefathers, added weight and solemnity to the precepts of the law. But,in our language, the transition from speaking to singing is so great, that it appears to be natural only when some powerful emotion of the mind is to be expressed or excited. The genius of our language seems to reject the aid of music, whenever the mind is calm, and reason wide awake. And, even in the most animated strains of eloquence, the English orator would render himself ridiculous, were he to attempt to enliven his oration by a variety of musical tones. But when the soul is overwhelmed with grief, or when it is elated with joy or admiration, the voice, in all languages, involuntarily utters tones very different from the sounds of ordinary discourse; and, under such circumstances, the union of music with words may be very impressive, and seems natural and proper.

The above remarks are offered with diffidence; but if there be any truth in them, little difficulty can arise in determining what parts of our church-service should be read, and which should be chanted.

It is, by some, urged that in the English cathedrals the greater part of the service is chanted. But let it be remembered that the church-service was anciently performed in Latin, and originally introduced from a foreign country; wherefore, (with all due deference be it said) it seems probable that this practice, which prevails in the cathedrals alone, has been continued, rather through respect for antiquity than on account of its intrinsic propriety. Scarcely any thing can be named to which we may not be inured by habit, and for which we may not acquire a partiality by association of ideas; but those who are about to establish any custom, should, if possible, be guided by the dictates of unbiassed nature, rather than by the authority of foreign example.

As the organist necessarily bears so conspicuous a part in the music of every church where there is an organ, a few remarks upon his duties and qualifications may not here be improper.

Very few organists are found to give general satisfaction. Nor is this to be wondered at; for they too often consider what they have to do in church as a mere pastime, or as an opportunity for them to exhibit their musical abilities; while they little think that to form an accomplished organist, the union of many exalted and rare qualities is requisite. As one who can put words and sentences together with perfect grammatical propriety and great harmony of diction, may nevertheless be a very insipid writer or speaker; thus, an organist may possess a thorough knowledge of harmony; he may have the most rapid finger, and be able to perform all his tricks with the greatest dexterity, and yet be a very dull or even disgusting performer. An organist should, besides a complete knowledge of the theory and practice of music, possess a vigour of genius bordering upon enthusiasm; he should have a keen sense of the sublime, and a native taste for the pathetic, together with the faculty of pouring forth his feelings without restraint or premeditation; he should perfectly understand the language of those whom he accompanies, that he may know how to assist the words by a just expression; and, to crown all, he should

have an humble and devout mind, deeply impressed with the idea that his business is not to attract the attention of his auditors to himself, but to inspire them with religious sentiments, and to lift their souls from earth to heaven. All these qualities can hardly be expected to meet in one person; but it may afford some encouragement to the organist who is desirous of doing his duty, to be assured, that, if he can divest himself of that vanity which is so inherent in our nature, and so obtrusive on every occasion; if, while playing, he can *feel* that he is engaged in a religious duty, and accountable for his performance, not only to man, but immediately to his Maker; that, if he can attain such a temper of mind, it will compensate a multitude of defects, and can hardly fail of giving a character to his music much more impressive and appropriate than can ever be attained by the greatest skill of a mere musician. M.

[*We have been requested to insert the following extract from a Sermon preached in the State of Maryland. Its object is to repel some popular objections urged in that quarter against the Church.*]

For the Churchman's Magazine.

Extract from a Sermon preached in Maryland.

WHILE it is a right which all others claim, of defending their own Church; it becomes to us also a sacred right, as well as our indispensable duty, to instruct the members of our Church in its peculiar principles, to repel the attacks made upon it, and to prove that we are not "following cunningly devised fables." Far be it from us to reflect unnecessarily upon any denomination of Christians: On the contrary, we wish to all, who name the name of Jesus, success in all their *laudable* attempts to bring sinners into the fold of the Shepherd of Israel. But, surely, when much pains are taken to unsettle the minds of our people, and to prejudice them against that form of sound doctrine, handed down to us from the earliest times; the duty of counteracting those pernicious impressions

must be so obvious to all, and so consonant with the principles of equal right, as to require no apology. While this prejudice exists, disaffection will prevail, and an effectual bar be placed against any good to be derived from the ordinances of the Church.

It would be impossible in a short discourse to take a view of all the arguments used against the Church; but there are two points much insisted on, specious at first view, upon which I beg leave to make a few remarks.

1. It is said, "There is no religion in the Church; while there is much out of it." 2. "The multitude are opposed to the Church."

1. "There is no religion in the Church, while there is much out of it." If religion consists in splendid professions, we must indeed give up the point. We can boast of none among us so righteous as to sound a trumpet before them, and proclaim the measure of their perfection. Alas! if we are to be tried by these rules, we shall be vastly wanting, and, with millions of our forefathers, lost to all eternity. But if we may be allowed to judge of it by its fruits, by its influence upon the lives of men, and by this rule, "If ye love me, keep my commandments," we have some reason humbly to hope, that there are a few among us who are walking according to the spirit of the gospel, "whose praise is in the same;" and to congratulate ourselves, that we have to do with a Judge who alone has a right to determine the condition and destiny of man—a Judge who will reward only that kind of religion, which, instead of evaporating in an hour, makes its subject at all times devout, calm, discreet, honest, merciful, and charitable. Religion is intended, while it gives comfort to the heart, to regulate the actions of men. Take a view of it in this respect, and I am persuaded, that we shall, in our common intercourse with each other, find as much honesty, punctuality, benevolence, good will, and all the virtues of the gospel among Church people, as amongst those who set up for the exclusive possession of it.

2. "The multitude are against us, and this circumstance affords a proof of the fallacy of our system." This, by proving too much, proves nothing. If this be the criterion by which we determine the truth of a religion, we may fairly establish that of Paganism; for its followers are far more nu-

merous than those of Christianity itself. Admitting the fact that the multitude are against us. Is truth less truth because obscured and opposed? No, my brethren, our Church here may be depressed. Her friends may have dealt treacherously with her. But shall we forsake a friend because in distress and deserted by others? Shall we abandon our mother because in affliction, and because our friendship for her brings down on us the contumely of the world? Rather shall she be dearer to me—rather let this arm be palsied, and every sinew be withered, than I will forsake thee, O thou Zion, that hast brought me forth.

Her sun may be obscured for a time, but it is not yet gone down. This venerable fabric of our Church, cleared out of the rubbish of ages, cemented by the blood of our ancestors, has survived the shock of time, and will yet survive all the edifices of modern novelty. This is the Church in which Cranmer, Latimer, Redley, and others, who gloried in the flames, have been prepared for the reward of martyrdom. In this our forefathers, and many who were near and dear to us, we humbly trust, have been made meet for the kingdom of heaven. And shall we, becoming wiser than all who have gone before, abandon these old paths? Let us be careful in matters of everlasting moment. We are sure of safety in the ark: But let every one beware how he abandons it for any substitute of man's devising. The latter times are coming on, of which we are warned in the scriptures, in which days many shall say, "Lo, here is Christ, and there is Christ." "Go not after them." Let us be on our guard against error, as against vice; being "wise as serpents," as well as "harmless as doves," "taking upon us the whole armour of God, that we may be able to stand in the evil day." "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see; and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls."

For the Churchman's Magazine.

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, *by the Rev.* JAMES KEMP, *D. D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.*

(Continued from p. 292.)

LETTER VI.

Testimony of the Reformers.

The opinions of the Reformers to be drawn from the public standards. Calvin the author of Parity. The positions of Dr. Miller stated and considered. The Waldenses Episcopal. Wickliffe no Presbyterian. The Bohemian and Moravian Brethren Episcopal. Some variety of opinion among the English Reformers at first. Cranmer in particular changed his opinion. The Liturgy, Articles, and Ordinal, all Episcopal, and fixed by the most pious and learned of the Clergy, under no control. The origin of the opposition to Episcopacy. Some irregularities under Arch-Bishop Grindal. The Reformation in Scotland. The Lutheran Church. Geneva, the only source of Parity. All the other Reformers averse to that doctrine. The Methodists.

REV. SIR,

IN a discussion of this kind, it is admitted, that the opinions of learned and pious men, who were engaged in the arduous and interesting work of reforming the Church from the abuses and corruptions of a long series of years, are of weight. Yet in ascertaining these opinions, great caution must be observed. We must not conclude, from the propositions made, and the opinions advanced, during the various discussions and arguments, that these opinions ultimately prevailed. It is from the result that we are to judge. It is from the *standards* which they fixed; from the *articles* upon which they agreed; and from the *system of government* which they established, that we are to draw the opinions of the Reformers.

I am one of those who believe that *Calvin* was "the first

distinguished and successful advocate for the doctrine of *parity.*" And upon this side of the question, among many other great names, there is one on whom I think much reliance is to be placed. I mean the venerable *Hooker.* He was a man of great piety, extensive learning, unwearied industry, and nice precision, in the investigation of truth. He lived in an age when the question respecting the true government of the Christian Church was warmly agitated, between the Puritans and the Church. He had a complete knowledge of the rise and progress of the doctrine of parity. And his fairness and liberality qualified him, in a high degree, to decide upon the matter. He says, then, in the preface to his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, that the doctrine advocated by the Puritans was, "*only by error and misconception, named the Ordinance of Christ;*" and that the founder of this doctrine was Calvin.

You advance, however, the following positions—"*that the most distinguished witnesses for Evangelical truth, through the dark ages, long before Calvin lived, maintained the doctrine of ministerial parity—that the earliest Reformers, both in Great-Britain and on the continent of Europe, admitted the same principle—that all the reformed Churches, excepting that of England, were organized on this principle—that the Church of England stands alone, in the whole Protestant world, in making Diocesan Bishops an order of Clergy superior to Presbyters—and that those venerable men, who finally settled her government and worship, did not consider this superiority as resting on the ground of divine appointment, but of ecclesiastical usage and human expediency.*" p. 212.

The proofs adduced, in support of these positions, shall now be examined.

1. The *Waldenses* are generally represented as a pious and austere people. But I can find no satisfactory proof, that they held the doctrine of parity. In the articles of their faith, as preserved by Bishop Newton, there is nothing explicit to this purpose. Nor do the best historians, Reinerius, Thuanus and Mezerey yield any sufficient ground of belief, that they adopted this doctrine. Dr. Mosheim says expressly, "the government of the Church was committed, by the Waldenses, to Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, for they acknowledged, that these three orders were instituted by Christ himself." They dis-

claimed the supremacy of the Pope, and this, I believe, will be found to be the principal innovation that they attempted in Church government.

When you bring forward the celebrated Wickliffe as an advocate for your doctrine of ministerial parity, we must regard you as having shifted your ground: For, even in the quotation that you have made from his life, it is said, that he boldly asserted, "there were only *two* orders of clergy in the primitive Church." It will not be wondered at, that, however great the genius, however acute the penetration of this man might be, he should not be right in all respects. The clouds of ignorance and error were then so thick and impenetrable, that few rays of light could dart through them. Surely the man who thought that Popes, Cardinals, Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Arch-Deacons, Officials and Deans, were ever considered as "*distinct orders*," cannot be admitted to have had very correct information on the subject. He seems to have been under the same impression with Mr. Tindall and John Lambert. They saw, clearly, that two orders existed in the ministry, together with the Apostles, but they did not advert to the continuance of the Apostolic order, nor its authority in the Church. The subject had not then been sufficiently considered; but, as it is well remarked by our amiable prelate of Pennsylvania, "the more the subject is canvassed, the more the fact will be evident, of there never having been a period in the Christian Church, without an order of the Clergy cloathed with certain authorities, including that of ordination, not committed to the other orders."*

John Huss and Jerome of Prague, we are told, received the books of Wickliffe, and advanced and propagated very much the same doctrines. Their descendants, the Bohemian brethren, who received the succession from the Waldenses, continued to maintain the same tenets. Among the articles of faith ascribed to them by Æneas Sylvius, we find the following: "The Pope of Rome is equal with other Bishops. Among Priests there is no difference. It is not dignity but merit that renders one Presbyter preferable to another." Here there is surely no explicit declaration in favour of parity. And Dr. Mosheim is again clearly on our side. He says, "the form of Episcopal polity

* Bishop White's sermon before the Convention, 1808.

was, with some small exceptions, adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian brethren."* And as to *their college of grave men*, Bucer is far from saying, that it was deemed of *divine* origin.

Thus, then, stands the case as to your first position. We have found a learned historian, who was no Episcopalian, and of course had no bias towards our side of the question, and who, moreover, had examined the best anthorities on the subject, asserting, in positive terms, that the form of government among both the Waldenses and Bohemian brethren was *Episcopal.* Nor is this historian corrected, as to matter of fact, by his equally learned translator Dr. Maclaine, who was a Presbyterian. It behoved you, therefore, to have adduced some new authority, some testimony unknown to these learned men, before you had ventured to controvert their opinions. Nor will it be expected that belief will be given to your position in preference to theirs, while you have so little to substantiate it.

2. "The Fathers of the reformation in England," you affirm, "were Presbyterians in principle: that is, a majority of the most pious and learned among them considered Bishop and Presbyter as the same by divine right." You will certainly expect, that we should look for strong proof, to make good this assertion. Because, if this be true, if men who protested against the corruptions of the Church, and maintained their principles, at all hazards, still fixed her standards upon principles which they did not hold, we must surely change our opinion of their integrity, and cease to call them either *venerable* or *pious.* But I have little fear, that upon an impartial examination of this matter, the English Reformers will continue to maintain the character which they have so long supported.

The first source of proof which you offer, is "*the Institution of a Christian Man.*" This book, I have not been able to obtain, nor indeed "*The necessary Erudition of a Christian Man.*" But if it be safe to judge from the time when the first book, in particular, was published, and from the substance of it given by Collier in his Ecclesiastical history, I should conclude, that the reformation had made little progress. The principal doctrines of the Church of Rome, against which the reformation

* Mosh. vol. iv. p. 420.

was aimed, are there retained and illustrated. Nor does it appear, that it had advanced far, when the *erudition* was published. It was during the reign of Henry VIII. in which there was but little done, as to principles and doctrines. Besides, I can perceive nothing clearly and unequivocally at variance with Episcopacy. Bishops and their office are recognized. Orders are said to have been originally conferred by the Apostles, and now by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop: and when the two orders of Priests and Deacons are mentioned, they appear to be considered as subordinate.

Your next resort is to the answer given by some of the *select assembly of divines*, appointed for the settlement of religion, to one of the questions under consideration. Cranmer, the Bishop of St. David's, and Westminster, with Dr. Cox, and Dr. Redmayn, to the question, "whether Bishops or Priests were first," replied, "Bishops and Priests were at one time, and were not two things, but one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion." From this opinion all the other divines of the assembly dissented. And eleven of them considered Bishops as distinct from, and superior to Priests in office, by divine appointment. Besides, this transaction was not, as you have stated, in the reign of Edward VI. but in that of Henry VIII. This is asserted by both Burnet and Collier; and the mistake of Stillingfleet probably arose from his confounding this assembly with the committee of selected Bishops and Divines called in the year 1548, "*for the examining all the offices of the Church, and for reforming them.*" The crude and ill digested notions respecting the Christian ministry that prevailed with some at this period, when the dawn of the morning began to yield only a faint and glimmering light, are considered by Bishop Burnet as deviations from primitive principles. Speaking of a paper drawn up in the year 1537 or 38, and signed by Cromwell, and a number of Bishops and other divines, he says, "in this writing, and in '*The necessary Erudition of a Christian Man*,' Bishops and Priests are spoken of as one and the same office. In the ancient Church they knew none of those subtilties that were found out in latter ages. It was then thought enough, that a Bishop was to be dedicated to his function by a *new* imposition of hands; and that several offices could not be performed

without Bishops, such as *ordination, confirmation,*"* &c. So far was he from considering the opinions in question, as having originated in the reformation, that he viewed them as relicks of Popery. In the same page he calls them, " *the very dregs of Popery.*" As the reformation advanced, he shows that these opinions yielded to the truth. " In Cranmer's papers," says he, meaning his answer to the question formerly mentioned, some singular opinions of his, about the " nature of Ecclesiastical offices will be found; but as they are delivered by him with all possible modesty, so they were not established as the doctrines of the Church, but laid aside as particular conceits of his own, and, it seems, *that afterwards he changed his opinion.* For he subscribed the book that was soon after set out, which is directly contrary to those opinions set down in these papers."†

The circumstance of Cranmer's receiving a new commission from Edward VI. you think, serves also to show, that he considered the Episcopal system in which he shared, as founded rather in human prudence and the will of the magistrate, than the word of God. Page 222. This I must protest against, as an inference highly inadmissible. Whatever Cranmer's opinion might be at that time, this act will not bear your construction. Had Cranmer applied for *new orders*, you might have very justly inferred that he regarded his Episcopal office as expiring with Henry VIII. But Episcopalians, Sir, look upon *orders* and *jurisdiction* as two different things. A minister may have regular and valid orders, and still no cure. An American Bishop, although the regularity of his orders would not be questioned, could not exercise his Episcopal functions in England, without permission from the government. And the observation of Bishop Burnet, with regard to letters patent, is equally applicable to the case of this new commission—" that the Episcopal function was of divine appointment, and that, by the letters patent, authority was given, in some particular place, to execute the duties of that function."‡

Thus far then, upon a fair view of things, we have found little to support your assertion, that a " majority of the most pious

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 366.
† Ibidem. page 289.
‡ Ibidem. part ii. page 218.

and learned among the English reformers were Presbyterians in principle." A few party and crude opinions, advanced a considerable time before permanent articles or standards were framed, constitute the amount of your evidence. Nay, on one occasion we have seen, that a large majority were tolerably correct Episcopalians.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

THE SABBATH.

SIX days to man hath the Creator given,
Reserving to himself but one in seven:
Nor for himself is this reserve alone,
The boon is ours, the advantage all our own;
To rest our labours on this weary stage,
To soothe the sorrows of our pilgrimage,
To taste the Fount whence all our bliss must come,
And bring us on to our celestial home,
Low on our knees within his courts to fall,
In praise to him, who made, preserves, and blesses all.

Then, sacred, sacred let his sabbaths be!
Nor rob with sacriligious hearts the Deity,
Else anguish shall attend thy impious gain,
And all thy wishes, all thy toils be vain—
Dash'd from thy lips the cup of bliss shall fall,
Or tasted, turn to bitterness and gall—
Thy joys shall vanish—all thy hopes shall die,
Like Sodom fruits before maturity—
This earth, thy care, no more shall smile for you,
Briars and thorns shall every path bestrew,
And *heaven* be lost for ever from thy view.

J. W.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

EPITAPH ON AN OLD NEGRO SLAVE.

HERE, Pedro, rest thy weary frame,
Peaceful in earth, from whence it came—
At morning's dawn, at evening's close,
Long hast thou sigh'd for this repose ;
Now all thy pains and sufferings past,
Thy sweet reward is come at last.—
Thy patient spirit, free as air,
Delivered from its anguish here,
Now triumphs, far beyond this sod,
In bliss, with thy Redeemer, God!

Thy task of toil and labour done,
Thy painful course of *slavery* run—
How many a rich and haughty lord,
Whose luxuries smoak upon his board,
Who lives in pomp, and mirth, and glee,
Will wish to change *his lot* with thee.

J. W.

DEATHS.

DIED on the 25th of July, at Huntington,(Con.) the Rev. Ambrose Todd. He was born December, 1764, of respectable parents, at Branford, in the county of New-Haven, and State of Connecticut, and graduated in Yale College, in the year 1786; the year following he was admitted to the order of Deacons in St. John's Church, at Stamford, by the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury; and in June, 1788, he was admitted to the order of Priests in St. Paul's Church, at Norwalk, by the same Bishop, and settled in the Church at Symsbury, with the charge of the churches adjacent.

He officiated there for eleven years, to the general satisfaction of all his parishioners. But his salary was inadequate to

the support of his family, and he was therefore induced to accept an invitation from the Church at Huntington, to the great grief of his parishioners at Symsbury. He took possession of the Church at Huntington in November, 1799, where he laboured in word and doctrine for the space of ten years.

He was attacked in the month of April last with a pulmonic complaint, which, notwithstanding the goodness of his constitution, in the short space of three months, terminated in his dissolution. He soon perceived his sickness was unto death. He gave all necessary directions respecting the settlement of his worldly affairs; freely conversed upon the subject of his dissolution; viewed with composure its approach; took an affectionate leave of his friends, commending them to the charge of a kind providence; and, with all calmness and serenity of mind, fell into the arms of death, in the forty-fifth year of his age; manifesting tokens of joy in the mercy of his Redeemer, and the final approbation of his Judge.

He viewed the plan of salvation as a rational system, founded on scripture evidence, and regulated his life and conversation by the light therein contained. His confidence arose from the evidence of God's word; and his life corresponding therewith, in the discharge of Christian duties. He cherished a strong faith in the atonement of a Saviour, and was firm in the persuasion that God will be faithful to his promises, and admit into his presence all those who, in simplicity and godly sincerity have their conversation in the world. In this faith he lived, and in this confidence he died. His manner of life was plain and familiar, and well calculated for the station which he filled. He was prudent in his secular concerns, and an active and faithful servant in the vineyard. He was much beloved by his parishioners, heard with attention, and treated with respect, and died much lamented. His life and conversation were such as to leave a lasting impression on all his acquaintances of his worth and usefulness.

Soon after his death the members of his congregation held a meeting, and voted to continue his salary during the year, for the benefit of his family, to defray his funeral expenses, and to erect a decent monument to his memory.

Died also at Huntington, after a long illness, Miss Martha P. Todd, aged 19 years, daughter of the Rev. Ambrose Todd.

She decayed gradually until a few days of her death, when her dissolution rapidly approached. Calm and serene in her disposition, placed and benign in her countenance, amiable and engaging in her manners, she trod the short path assigned her. She lived beloved, she died lamented, and her soul, we trust, rests in happiness, awaiting the consummation of bliss in a glorious resurrection.

Departed this life at Chester Town, Maryland on Thursday, the 7th of September, 1809, after a long and tedious illness, which she bore with *Christian fortitude*, Mrs. Mary Cannell, the affectionate consort of Isaac Cannell, jun. Esq. merchant of the same place. She *died* in the *full exercise* of her reason, *perfectly* resigned to the *will* of her Divine Master, and looking forward with a *confident hope* to the *joys* of a *glorious resurrection*.